# The QUEST OF GOD

CASPER S. YOST

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUN 28 1929
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BT 101 .Y67 1929
Yost, Casper Salathiel, 186-
-
The quest of God

# THE QUEST OF GOD

# THE QUEST OF GOD

A JOURNALIST'S VIEW OF THE BASES OF RELIGIOUS FAITH

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUN 28 1929
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

By
CASPER S. YOST
*Editorial Editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.*
*Author of "Principles of Journalism," etc.*

NEW YORK CHICAGO
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, MCMXXIX, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 851 Cass Street
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 99 George Street

*Affectionately dedicated*
*to one whose faith needs no argument—*
*My Wife.*

*"And ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart."*—JEREMIAH 29:13.

# PREFACE

THE business of any editorial writer is to discuss public questions of every sort for the information and perhaps the guidance of his readers. As he speaks usually not to a class but to the mass, it is important that he write in terms that appeal to the general understanding. This necessity accustoms him to a certain simplicity and directness of expression that may or may not be good diction, but that is at least plain and clear to the average mind. Even if he has some secret pride in a real or fancied erudition, he cannot afford to speak Greek to the multitude or to write in terms that are "caviar to the general."

Religion is always the most important of public questions. At this time when long established conventions are being set aside, when standards of morality are being altered, when crime has become commonplace and respect for law alarmingly lessened, when doubt and scepticism are prevalent, when some of the implications of science, some of the theories of psychology and some of the schools of philosophy are striking at

the foundations of belief, it is a public question of supreme importance.

This conviction, and the feeling that perhaps an unprejudiced layman, who is an editorial writer, might contribute something helpful to public interest and to individual welfare by a simple presentation of the fundamentals of religious belief, that is in harmony with the revelations of modern science, yet free as possible from unfamiliar terminology of science, philosophy or theology, are the reason and excuse for this little book.

The desire of the writer is to speak of these things to the average man in his own language, and particularly to those of the youth of America who are wondering, questioning, doubting, yet who nevertheless are engaged in that eternal quest from which none can wholly escape.

To those who may say that it is presumption for a layman to discuss these questions, the writer would answer that the vocation of religion is every man's business, an essentially individual matter, however much its practice may be aided by organized promotion or collective action, and that all but a comparative few who are engaged in this supreme calling are laymen.

C. S. Y.

*St. Louis, Missouri.*

## CONTENTS


I

THE ETERNAL QUEST . . . . . 11

II

THE SENSE OF DEITY . . . . . 29

III

TRUTH OR ILLUSION . . . . . 47

IV

THE DIVINE CIRCLE . . . . . 66

V

THE HUMANITY OF GOD . . . . . 82

VI

GOD IN MAN . . . . . 90

VII

JESUS THE REVEALER . . . . . 102

VIII

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL . . . . . 113

IX

THE GOAL BEYOND . . . . . 135

# I

## THE ETERNAL QUEST

THROUGH a certain window one may see the dome of a great cathedral rising majestically above the verdure. If one rises early enough, one may see the dome outlined against a morning sky which gradually takes on the entrancing tints of dawn. Presently the sun tips the cross upon the dome with golden light as if in benediction, and then envelopes the whole in glorious refulgence.

There is perhaps no work of man as impressive to the eye and the spirit as the cathedral. In magnitude and beauty combined it is the supreme achievement of human architecture; and the object of its creation gives it a spiritual significance and awakens a spiritual reverence that no other edifice can inspire. Regardless of the sect that may have raised it, it is representative at once of man's highest creative attainment and of man's constant effort to express and to define his relation to something that he terms the creator of the universe.

In the varied phenomena of nature there is nothing which appeals more strongly to the eye or the soul than the sunrise. Merely as a spectacle it is always impressive and often transcendently beautiful; and it is easy to understand the feeling of awe which it aroused in the ancients, who regarded the diurnal rebirth of the sun as a tremendous miracle, who worshipped the sun as the supreme divinity, and who, because of this, attached a sacredness even to the East from which it comes that has survived the mutations of cosmogony and religion, and in many lands is even yet reverently respected.

So that in the view from this window at dawn it may be said that one gets a glimpse of the mind and the spirit of man at his best, and seemingly of the mind of his maker in its most resplendent manifestation. In the impress which the latter makes, and has always made, upon human thought and feeling, we can discern the sources of science and of religion. For from the impress upon thought of the phenomena of the firmament came the first, and still the greatest, of all sciences; and from the impress of this and other natural phenomena upon the thought, the feeling and the intuitions sprang all of those many and varied concepts of reason and of instinct that we call

religion. In the former we can see the symbol of man's eternal and universal response to the harmony of external impress and of internal urge. Man ever seeks to comprehend the wonders of creation of which he is himself a part, and he ever seeks to find and to establish communion with their source. These are the supreme quests of human endeavour, and to them man has given his profoundest thought.

With this cathedral dome against the background of the sunrise in our mind's eye, let us embark upon the quest of God. Let us consider first the cathedral, by way of approach to our object. To do this properly let us withdraw from the window, put on our hats and take the short walk to a point where we can see the entire edifice. We now discover that the dome surmounts a great building of grey stone, harmonious in proportion and in tone, with a general effect of stability, strength and permanence. It fills the eye and appeals to the imagination. It is a work of art, mighty and beautiful. Its broad doors invite entrance. Let us go in.

We are struck at first with the immensity of its interior. There is something in its mere vastness that inspires awe. And this feeling is mingled with a swelling delight as we observe the exquisite

beauty of its form and its colouring, the intricate mosaic of its walls and of its high-vaulted nave and transept, the grace of its slender columns, the magic of the tinted light that pours through its windows, its resplendent altar, and far above, as if swinging from the heaven itself, its crowning glory, the inner side of the dome that first impressed us. And now the great organ peals, and sound and sight and place impel to worship.

We do not need to be told that all this is the work of man. We know it is. If any one should presume to question it, we would draw away from him as one obviously of deranged intelligence, and if he attempted to argue the matter, we would be alarmed and hurriedly escape. But how do we know it? We know, in the first place, that such things do not exist by accident or miracle. There are legends of structures being raised by magic without the touch of man, but we dismiss such as childish fancies. We are also more or less familiar with the methods and the materials of such a construction. It is an extraordinary achievement but there is nothing in it that we do not recognize as man's handiwork, of much the same character as man has been doing for ages. But even if we knew none of this, if its materials were entirely new to us,

if its form were quite novel, and if it were raised by means unknown to us and beyond our comprehension, still we would have no doubt that man had built it.

Moreover, we know without being told that this building was erected for a specific purpose. The evidence of design, and a particular design, meet the eye in every detail of its construction. We know also that although many men contributed to this construction, there was one man who designed it and by whom, through the human and other forces which he called into action, it was given form. We know, furthermore, that the idea of this edifice was first conceived in his mind, that before any plans were drawn or any work started he had visioned the completed structure, had decided upon its form and dimensions, all with respect to its use.

There was, then, back of this cathedral, first of all, a mind. Into this mind came a thought, and that thought was elaborated by the mind until the structure stood forth, fully envisaged. This done, the thought was first expressed in detailed plans for the guidance of others, and under the direction of this mind workmen and tools and machinery were brought into action to give the thought the material form that the mind had conceived.

Knowing all this, we are aware that Thought created this building, that it is, in fact, the material production of an immaterial force. We know that it could not have been created by material processes alone, that it could never have come into existence without this immaterial power which conceived it and planned it for a definite purpose, and which raised it through its controlling influence upon the inferior forces subject to it.

We know that all this is true, yet we do not know how it is true. There is no greater mystery than that of the mind. It is something entirely beyond our comprehension. It is invisible and intangible. We cannot dissect it, or analyze it, nor can we observe it through the highest powered microscope. We have, to be sure, strong reason to believe that it functions chiefly in and by means of the brain, and we can study its actions and reactions by means of its visible phenomena, but that provides no solution of the mystery. Yet there is no fact in life more certain than its existence and its power. Each man in himself is conscious of his mind as he is conscious of nothing else. Indeed, it is only through his mind that he is conscious of anything, for the mind is the seat of all consciousness. But even so, it is beyond his understanding. Nevertheless,

it was this mysterious, impalpable power that created this splendid cathedral.

But let us now turn to the consideration of the eastern sky with which we have associated this structure. The sunrise is in itself an illusion. The sun—as we know now, though it was not known until comparatively recent years—does not rise. We have learned through the advance of science that the sun is relatively stationary, and that the appearance of rising is caused by the turning of the earth upon its axis. But to the ancients, whether wise or foolish, the rising of the sun was a daily phenomenon which was not considered open to question; and that conviction was so fixed in humanity that we still speak of the "sunrise" and have acquired no new word to describe the phenomenon in harmony with the fact.

In truth it seems to rise, and the scientific explanation does not alter the impressiveness of its appearance. When, therefore, we see its gradual approach indicated by the dissipation of darkness, and the changing tints of its heraldic banners upon the sky, and then the entry of the majestic orb itself, we feel much the same awe as the ancients, who endowed it with personality and bowed down to it as the living lord of the universe.

And, indeed, it is the physical lord of our universe. It may be but one of many suns, as the astronomers tell us, but to us it is the source of life. We exist only through its light and heat. It is our very mother, for out of it earth was born, and by it earth is constantly sustained. So that when we watch the rising sun we are observing the chief factor and the chief physical agency of creation in so far as humanity is concerned.

None the less, it is but one of innumerable bodies that make up what is termed the universe. But what is this universe that the sun so splendidly represents to our eyes? We see it spread before us at night when the sun retires and permits us to observe other glories than its own, and we are overwhelmed by the vastness and the beauty of it. Then we understand the feeling of the Psalmist, which caused him to cry out with exalted enthusiasm, "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament sheweth his handiwork." When we consider this, when we consider the sun by day in his solitary majesty, and when we consider the earth itself in all its varied and countless details, all a part of a system of inconceivable magnitude, the profound question of the source of it presses upon the inquiring mind for an answer.

To the great majority of mankind in all ages

the answer has been as simple and as obvious as the question of the source of the cathedral was to us. We knew without inquiry that man created the cathedral; is it not equally manifest that God created the universe? If we assume, to begin with, that there is a God, it seems reasonable to assume also that this is His handiwork. But is there a God? And if there is, does the evidence justify the assumption that He is the source of the universe, including our own earth and our own life?

We are quite sure that earth exists, we are quite sure of the sun and the stars, we are quite sure that we live and move and have our being. These are plainly observable facts, and whatever questions we may raise as to their nature and processes, we do not doubt that they exist. But how did they come into existence? Are they merely the fortuitous products of natural processes, or are they products of intelligent and purposive design? Science, which has brought to the solution of physical problems the highest order of intellect applied with laudable devotion to truth, has found in all the operations of nature throughout the universe the unmistakable evidences of order, the unmistakable evidences of inviolable law. Laws do not make themselves. They must

have a maker, and laws are never made without a purpose. There must, then, be a maker of nature's laws and that maker must have had an object in making them. Furthermore, there is unmistakable evidence of design in the symmetry and beauty and utility of the universe.

Law and design and purpose necessarily proceed from will, and such will is necessarily a function of intelligence. This universe, then, must be a product of mind just as certainly as our cathedral was a product of mind. This certainty has impressed the great thinkers of all ages with conviction, and not less so those of this age. Many philosophers, to be sure, give this intelligence various names, such as the Absolute and the Unknowable, but by whatever the name the fact is recognized, and thereby accepted, that it is an intelligence, a supreme intelligence.

"The systematic unity of nature," says Kant, "impels us to regard all order in the world as if it originated from the intention and design of a Supreme Reason."[1] It is the product, that is to say, of thought, and thought implies a thinker. No mechanistic theory of creation by processes of development will supply an explanation that is satisfactory. "I would rather believe all the

[1] *Critique of Pure Reason.*

fables in the Talmud and the Koran," says Bacon, "than that this universal form is without a mind." Paley insisted upon "the necessity in each particular case of an intelligent designing mind for the contriving and determining of the forms which organized bodies bear." [2]

"This most beautiful system of the sun, planets and comets could only proceed from the counsel and dominion of an intelligent and powerful being," said Isaac Newton. "Faith in order, which is the basis of science, cannot reasonably be separated from faith in an ordainer, which is the basis of religion," declares Asa Gray. The widely accepted theory of evolution has not altered in the least the necessity for the recognition of an intelligence directing it. For as Ladd emphatically states, "Evolution cannot even be conceived of except in connection with the postulate of some Unitary Being immanent in the evolutionary process, which reveals its own nature by the nature of the Idea, which in fact is progressively set into reality by the process." [3]

It seems, therefore, as obvious that thought created the rising sun and all of the universe as that thought created the cathedral. And there is

[2] *Natural Theology.*
[3] *Knowledge, Life and Reality.*

no reason to suppose that the thought which created the one was any different in essence from the thought that created the other, however vast the difference between them in magnitude and power. In both can be discerned, by observation of their material products, the evidences of an immaterial force working through matter and upon matter to give form and substance to physical creations.

However, in the case of the human architect, it may be objected, we can see all the sequences of the process. We can note the Idea as it is expressed in the blue-prints, and we can follow the development of the plans through the various stages of construction. In the case of the other we see only the effect and can but assume a cause. The process, the *modus operandi,* is hidden from us. There is truth and error in this contention. That the cathedral grows out of the plans before our eyes is undeniable. But our observation began with the plans. The all-important part of the process preceded the plans. The cathedral was, in fact, created in the mind of the architect before any part of the process of its physical realization was begun. We cannot see how that was done, nor do we know how it was done.

We can understand, of course, the influences of

education and experience which contributed to the idea and which enabled the architect to make it a reality, and we can observe the processes of thought through its visible manifestations; but thought itself, the mind, the essential creative power, is as profound a mystery as life, unexplained and perhaps never explainable. Physiological science finds in the brain of man the supreme instrument of human thought, and it has found that certain areas of the brain have certain functions directly responsive to the consciousness. So also an automobile has certain levers which actuate its mechanism when moved by the driver, but it is something above and superior to the levers, the mind of the driver, that directs the car. Psychology observes the phenomena of the mind as they are expressed in conduct, but these are products, not the thing itself.

So again, the conduct of a car under the direction of the driver may reveal something of the character of the driver, but the car and the driver are separate things, the one merely the instrument of the other. The scientist studies the phenomena of electricity by which its existence is manifested, and the electrical engineer generates this force by means of mechanical or chemical devices and applies it to countless uses; but all such manifesta-

tions are the conduct of the thing, not the thing itself, which is still an unsolved mystery. Science does not know what electricity is, what life is or what mind or spirit is, but all these exist, and science deals with their observable manifestations, with their "behaviour," to use a psychological term.

Mind created the cathedral and mind created the universe. The mystery of the latter seems profounder only because the former functions in all human experience; we are familiar with it; it is a force which we ourselves use constantly; we are conscious of it every hour; we know, each of us, what it does.

We have no knowledge of mind outside of a physical body, but we are constantly aware of the existence of mind so embodied, and we see daily evidences of the work of that mind, operating by means of physical agencies subject to it and directed by it to create innumerable things of use and beauty. We connect creation and creator directly and we have no doubt that one is the cause of the other. Nor do we doubt that the idea, the conception, the plan, have their origin in a mind, that that mind is the source of the creation, its author and finisher. We do not doubt this because we see clearly the relation between

cause and effect, though we do not and cannot understand all the processes of origin.

When, therefore, we see creations that are obviously not the productions of man, but which are just as obviously works of order, of design, of purpose, of beauty, is it not a logical assumption that these, too, were somewhat similarly conceived and executed, and that they, too, are products of mind operating by means of physical agencies in the construction of physical things? And if we assume that the cause is relatively of the same nature, is it not possible to observe the relation between cause and effect in these creations also?

Let us consider this world upon which we dwell and that same sun whose so-called rising we have just observed. Whatever may be the truth as to the beginning of this world, science is agreed that it came out of this sun, that by the power exercised by the sun it is held to a certain course around the parent body; that this and its own revolutions have shaped it; and that the light and heat that it has drawn from the sun have been the constant generative forces of all life upon this planet. The sun, that is to say, is the physical instrument of all that creation in which we are concerned and of which we are a part. But we cannot conceive that the sun itself is mind. Rather

does it seem to be the agency by which physical power has been directed by a supreme intelligence in the shaping of matter and the production of life; for the form and order and harmony and usefulness of this creation will not permit our own intelligence to regard it as the mere chance consequences of purely mechanical processes.

In the creation of this world, and of the universe, there is another likeness to the cathedral. That structure, regarded as an example of man's creative power, we may have seen in the course of its erection, or, if not, we can see daily the building of other structures which give illustration of man's creative faculty. We know, furthermore, that man has been thus creating through uncounted centuries, and we have reason to believe that his existence as man began with the creative faculty and urge. Man constantly creates, so far as science has been able to discover has always created, and in the nature of his being must continue to create. This, it seems, is in harmony with universal creation. For plainly it is a continuous process. The astronomer sees in the nebulæ the first visible stage of stellar creation, and in the myriad suns, which he beholds, he observes the evidences of a steadily progressive construction. Stars at perhaps the moment of

birth, stars in their infancy, stars in their youth, stars in their age and stars in the throes of death, parade endlessly before him, disclosing a universe of constant, ordered, never-ceasing production.

The same record of continuing processes is to be seen by any one on this planet, not merely in the globe itself, but in every detail of organic and inorganic life. Geology reveals a world in the making, a world that has been in the process of making for countless ages, and that is still structurally unfinished. Biology tells the same story of constant creative activity. But without any aid of science we can see creation going on daily. We can see it in the springing up and growth of all vegetation. The fields and the forests are constant evidences of a continuous creation. All the phenomena of birth spread creation before our eyes, and each man of us is in himself a proof of its unceasing activity. Creation is a perpetual process in the universe, and in the world which is a part of it. And if creation is a product of mind, of intelligence, of spirit, as reason tells us it is, then we may be sure that that mind, that intelligence, that spirit, is ever at work, is at work now, all about us and in us. Obviously it is not something that with a magic finger touched the universe into being ages ago and then departed, but some-

thing that is eternally here, eternally with us, and, like man, its offspring, eternally busy at the task of creation, enfolding us and all things in its constant embrace.

"The same Power which brought the universe into existence is regulating and controlling it,"[4] says Sir Oliver Lodge. "It looks as if nature were nature for a purpose, and as we cannot predicate a purpose in a vast system we must reverently ascribe it to a creator,"[5] concludes J. Arthur Thomson. And Lloyd Morgan declares, "I acknowledge God as the Nisus through whose activity all emergents emerge and the whole course of emergent evolution is directed."[6] When science turns from the study of material facts to the consideration of the causes of the phenomena with which it deals, it confronts the evidences of an infinite Creative Intelligence. Even Darwin admits the "impossibility of conceiving this immense and wonderful universe, including man with his capacity of looking backward and far into futurity, as the result of blind chance or necessity."[7]

---

[4] *Evolution and Creation.*
[5] *Concerning Evolution.*
[6] *Emergent Evolution.*
[7] *Life and Letters.*

## II

## THE SENSE OF DEITY

THE quest so far has been upon the avenue of reason. It has been concerned only with thought in relation to matter, in the physical evidences of creation as a product of mind and the impress of such creations upon the intellectual faculty. But man feels as well as thinks, and his feeling is often superior to his thinking.

In this quest feeling gives support to reason in the contemplation of nature. For one can hardly view nature in some of her aspects without a sense of something greater than nature, superior to nature, that cannot be defined, but that stirs deep emotions as if spirit had called to spirit in a voiceless code that speaks to the heart. "I have felt," says Wordsworth—

> *"A presence that disturbs me with the joy*
> *Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime*
> *Of something far more deeply interfused*
> *Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,*
> *And the round ocean, and the living air,*
> . . . . . .

*And the blue sky, and in the mind of man;*
*A motion and a spirit, that impels*
*All thinking things, all objects of all thought,*
*And rolls through all things.*"

This sense of a presence, something alive in nature, that encompasses it and vitalizes it, has been felt by men in all ages and has been the mainspring of all religions. It is the apparently instinctive sense of the existence of something outside of man that is not visible, something to which he is subject, something which influences his being and conduct, something which he is impelled to recognize and to respect. Always man has endeavoured to lay his hands upon it, to define it, to visualize it, to give it form, locality and name, and to conceive its attributes.

" Investigation of the long history of mankind," says the professor of natural science in the New College of Edinburgh, " has disclosed no period in which the most distinctive thing about him has not been his sense of Powers or a Power expressing itself in the Universe, with which he instinctively wished to come into some sort of a satisfactory relationship. There is in man a sense of need and dependence on something without him, there is that in his being which goes out to something in the universe which he feels

secures his place in it, and with which he desires to be at one. . . . Man, that is to say, whether he likes it or not, is distinctively the religious creature."[1]

Descartes says the idea of God originates along with the idea of self and is innate in the same sense as the latter. Man, that is to say, from the first dawn of self-consciousness, whenever that may have been, has had accompanying intuitions of deity, and the researches of anthropology seem to give continuous and firm support to that view. However vague and crude the conception it has apparently existed, and universally existed, as long as man has been capable of thought, as long as man has been man.

It is no less clear that as the consciousness of man has developed and his culture has correspondingly increased, his conception of deity has been progressively refined and expanded. Never has the sense of deity left him, never has reason or experience effaced it. On the contrary, it has maintained itself as an imperishable and unchanging urge inherent in man's nature, impervious to all assaults of metaphysics, unaffected by all the advances of science. To-day it is just as universal, just as impelling, as in the mind of

[1] Simpson, *Man and the Attainment of Immortality.*

primitive man, perhaps more so. Man may deny it, and say unto himself that he has reasoned it out of existence, but let him come to the test of sudden and extreme peril or of profound sorrow, and he finds it still enthroned within him, unconquerable and inexpugnable.

But even so, does it prove anything? It proves for one thing that it is so deeply and firmly fixed within man that it cannot be eradicated. And it proves for another that whatever the evolutionary process in the development of man's consciousness, this persists unchanged, surviving all mutations and all adverse influences. There must be a reason for this persistence. It must have a purpose in human life or it would not constantly rise so superior to all the experience of uncounted millenniums. And that purpose seems plainly to be seen in its effect in the constant disposition of humanity to seek some understanding with deity, some helpful association; to give, in short, some expression to this innate prompting in the form of religion.

All creation conforms to certain laws of being and action, and all living things at least to laws of being, action, growth and development. In the lowest forms of life are observable impulses of action common to all members of a specific group,

which are essential to the maintenance of its existence and the perpetuation of its kind. And these impulses, if not properly designated instincts, have in them, at any rate, the germ of those innate protective and promotive propensities which are termed instincts in the higher forms of animal life, and which in man are the primary determining agencies of his progress. In man, to be sure, they are more or less restrained and directed by the intelligence, but no increase in man's intelligence displaces or diminishes them, and always they are dynamic qualities of his being, the forces that move him to action.

"The human mind," says a great psychologist, "has certain innate or inherited tendencies which are the essential springs or motive powers of all thought and action, whether individual or collective, and are the bases from which the character and will of individuals and of nations are gradually developed under the guidance of the intellectual faculties. These primary innate tendencies have different relative strengths in the native constitutions of the individuals of different races, and they are favoured or checked in very different degrees by the very different social circumstances of men in different stages of culture;

but they are probably common to the men of every race and of every age." [2]

He proceeds then to show that these innate tendencies are stable and unchanging and how they constantly influence human action, and expresses his conclusions as to their general effect in these words: "We may say, then, that directly or indirectly the instincts are the prime movers in all human activity; by the conative or impulsive force of some instinct (or of some habit derived from some instinct) every train of thought, however cold and passionless it may seem, is borne along toward its end, and every bodily activity is initiated and sustained. The instinctive impulses determine the ends of all activities and supply the driving power by which all mental activities are sustained; and all the complex intellectual apparatus of the most highly developed mind is but a means toward these ends, is but the instrument by which these impulses seek their satisfactions.

"Take away these instinctive dispositions with their powerful impulses and the organism would become incapable of activity of any kind; it would lie inert and motionless like a wonderful clock whose mainspring had been removed or a steam engine whose fires had been drawn. These

[2] McDougall, *Social Psychology*.

impulses are the mental forces that maintain and shape all the life of individuals and societies, and in them we are confronted with the central mystery of life and mind and will." [3]

If this is true, then it would seem that man has been somehow endowed from the beginning of conscious life with certain instinctive qualities, which have been unchanging and unchangeable, which have been as essential to his self-development as to his self-preservation; which have been the motive forces of his intellectual advancement, of his achievements in every department of science, art and general culture, and which are indispensable agencies of his life and his progress. Obviously, then, these are constructive forces, given him for constructive ends, and it is just as obvious that they are basic elements in his life, without which he could not exist.

Consider, for example, the fundamental instinct of self-preservation, the first law of nature, as it is often called. It is not a mere emergency instinct, expressing itself only in time of peril, but a constant force that concerns itself with all the problems of human existence. Self-preservation demands food, and out of that demand have come agriculture, horticulture, the domestication and

[3] *Ibid.*

propagation of animals for food uses, with all the innumerable refinements that have developed as man's culture has increased. Self-preservation demands the protection of clothing, and from that demand have come the many industries that supply him with this necessity. Self-preservation demands shelter, and in response to this demand man has set about building dwellings which have developed progressively from the crude primitive forms to the numerous types of buildings that house civilized mankind to-day, creating architecture and scores of trade and industries as means to such construction.

Self-preservation demands protection from disease and relief from injuries, and from this has come the science of healing in all its ramifications as well as the hospitals and other institutions which contribute so greatly to man's health. And self-preservation goes further than the individual. It encompasses the family, the community, the tribe, the State, giving one purpose to the gregarious or herd instinct, and thereby promoting social relations, the development of law and justice, the organization of governments and the sentiment of patriotism.

Consider the instinct of curiosity or exploration, which is man's eternal question mark. What?

How? Why? Man ever wants to know about things that arouse his interest. Curiosity draws attention, attention arouses inquiry, and inquiry produces knowledge. The child from early infancy begins to exercise this instinct, and as he grows a little older his persistent questions often irritate his parents. He is merely responding to nature's insistent urge. The whole business of science in all the ages has been directed to the what and the why of things, prompted to inquiry directly or indirectly by this innate tendency of the mind. What lies on the other side of the hill? What lies beyond that water? These questions of curiosity have ever been the inciting urge of geographical exploration, and following this prompting man has gone to the ends of the earth and opened it up to civilization. If curiosity did not awaken interest in the unknown one of the strongest incentives to inquiry, and through inquiry to the attainment of knowledge, would be lacking.

So the constructive influences of other instincts could be noted, all indicating an inherent stimulus to effort for preservation or progress in these fixed impulses of the mind, instincts that are the constant motivating powers in the development of man's intelligence. Clearly, then, they are essen-

tial agencies in man's progression, and essential agencies for his good, though the measure of their influence for good depends upon the extent of their rightful exercise under the guidance of intelligence.

They must be regarded, therefore, as among the necessary instruments of that progressive creation which we see going on about us, and must have come from the same source which governs it. That source, whatever it may be, must have implanted these instincts within man, for, having always existed, they are obviously not themselves products of development but the forces by which man's development is served. So if reason must assume a supreme intelligence responsible for the physical structure of the universe, it must also assume that these immaterial forces come from the same source, and are factors in the general process of creation which in man reaches its highest point.

But is the sense of deity instinctive? The one certain test of an instinct is that the trait makes its appearance before it has been possible to acquire it by experience or imitation. In man such evidence is limited to the first few days or weeks after birth, and thereafter it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish a native trait or

instinct from an acquired trait. Psychologists, therefore, differ greatly in their opinions as to what is and what is not an instinct. But man develops very slowly to maturity and it seems clear that some instincts do not make their appearance at birth but come into existence some time after birth as the circumstances of existence create a need for them. There can be no doubt, for example, that sex attraction is an instinct, yet it is rarely observable before the child reaches sexual maturity. And there are some emotions that are surely instinctive that await a measure of development in the child before they are observable. To all these this test cannot be applied.

There are, however, other tests, and perhaps the best one is that of universality. "When all individuals," says a psychologist, "having the same descent show a trait in common that trait is to be regarded as belonging to their native constitution (instinctive)—unless evidence can be brought forward to the contrary."[4] The universality of a trait, that is to say, strongly indicates that it is instinctive. In qualifying this rule he calls attention to the fact that a trait may be universal and not be native or instinctive, language, for example; or it may be native and not be

[4] Woodworth, *Psychology.*

universal, genius being perhaps a fair illustration. But the universality of a trait, he says, "creates a certain presumption in favour of its being native."

That religion in some form is universal is beyond question. That it has always been universal seems evident. No people has ever been found that did not have at least the germ of a religious idea and something in the nature of a religious practice. No matter how remote from other human contacts they may have been for ages, they have had a conception of divinity, however vague or however distorted, that influenced their lives. No one knows when or how the American hemisphere was populated. If, as plausibly conjectured, its people came originally from Asia, the fact that when discovered it was virtually all inhabited, indicates the process of populating the vast area must have occupied thousands of years. But all the people of this hemisphere were actuated by some more or less definite ideas of religion, all had some rites of a religious character, each of the countless tribes differing slightly or widely from all the others in the conception and exercise of religion. So, too, with the people of the remote islands of the seas. No matter what incalculable time had separated them from the

places of their origin they were found possessed of some measure and form of religion.

There is something exceedingly impressive in that universality. It does not seem credible that this trait, which is as universal among men as the physical characteristics which distinguish man from the inferior animals, could be other than native or instinctive in its elemental emotions and impulses. Nor does it seem possible that acquired traits of such fundamental likeness throughout the world and in all ages could have been developed and have been maintained with such persistency.

Of course, there is no doubt that religious practices and religious beliefs are and have always been acquired and transmitted from generation to generation; but that religion has existed everywhere in all times and among all people and that nowhere has it ever disappeared, indicates very clearly and strongly that back of all religious ideas and forms has ever been an innate tendency, an instinctive urge, common in all men, that has constantly and incessantly demanded a recognition of something superior to man and an effort to express that sense of divinity in some manner.

But there are other considerations. Religion is fundamentally an emotion. However it may be guided, directed or restrained by reason the emo-

tion is basic. Religion that is not felt in some degree is but a husk. And emotions, generally speaking, are instinctive feelings as distinguished from instinctive impulses, though as one authority says, "emotion and impulse so often go together, common sense does not bother to distinguish them."[5] It may be true, as psychologists tell us, that there are but few primary emotions—Watson concedes but three, fear, rage and love[6]—and that other emotions spring from these. There is so much difference of opinion among psychologists as to what is or what is not a primary emotion, as there is, for that matter, as to what is and what is not an instinct, that obviously no such opinion can yet be accepted as conclusive. Religion may or may not be a primary emotion, the weight of scientific authority is against that assumption, but if it is a universal product of emotions that are undoubtedly instinctive it surely is as much instinctive in itself as if it were a primary. The meticulous distinctions of scientific classification can matter nothing if the feeling or impulse, or both, are innate and native, as apparently they are in the emotion of religion. "The probability is," says Woodworth,

[5] Woodworth, *Psychology.*
[6] *Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviourist.*

"that the higher emotions, esthetic, social, religious, are derived from the primary in the course of the individual's experience."[7]

"It is clear," says McDougall, "that religious emotion is not a simple and specific variety, such as could be conditioned by any one instinct; it is rather a very complex and diversified product of the co-operation of several instincts, which bring forth very heterogeneous manifestations, differing from one another as widely as light from darkness, according to the degree and kind of guidance afforded by imagination and reason;"[8] and he states that the emotions which contribute most to religious emotion are "admiration, awe and reverence." Granting all this, these views amount to the assertion, from the standpoint of psychological science, that there are in fact instinctive bases for religious emotion and presumedly for religious impulses.

There is, in short, a religious sense or feeling that however complex it may be is at least instinctive in its sources, and its manifestations in the experience of mankind throughout the ages indicate by their universality that it is just as instinctive in fact and in effect as if it were a

[7] Woodworth, *Psychology.*
[8] McDougall, *Social Psychology.*

primary emotion, as indeed it may be. This being so, whence came it? Evidently it has always existed, and like other instincts that have been here mentioned has been a constructive force in the development of man's intelligence and the promotion of man's cultural progress. It has, to be sure, given rise to gross superstitions, as man's crude or misguided conceptions of its inner promptings have taken form, but it has compelled him to think, has compelled him to seek, and constantly its general trend has been upward. It has been the primary moving power in the origin of moral ideas and ideals. It has been the principal influence in promoting equitable social relations. It is obviously one of the essential agencies in human progression, and it seems to be a reasonable assumption that it is one of the elemental and fundamental forces in the processes of creation that constantly work forward. It must come, therefore, as all forces contributing to all progression in creation must have come, from the Intelligence that is the source of all such processes.

If, then, the Source of creation planted the sense of deity deeply and firmly within man from his very beginning, and made it impossible for him to eradicate it, the fact must have a meaning; and the only conceivable meaning that is

rational is that the source itself is deity, divinity, God; and that the Source not only desired that man should recognize this feeling, respond to its impulse and seek its object, but had made that seeking the means of man's spiritual evolution. It does not seem possible that man could be so universally endowed with that feeling, that urge, unless there is in reality something objective, some being, to which it applies. It does not seem possible that man everywhere and in all ages should have this sense of God unless there was a God to whose whispering it was a response. Surely it must be that, as the poet expresses it, "God is an unutterable sigh in the depths of the soul." "My wish," said Kepler, the astronomer, "is that I may perceive God, whom I find everywhere in the external world, in like manner within and inside me," and that is the eternal conviction and the eternal longing of mankind.

The pervasive desire to perceive, to find, to know, manifested universally in some form of religion, is also, and obviously, essential to man's existence and progress upward. Man it seems is incorrigibly religious because religion, however vague or feeble it may be, he must have. "If we traverse the world," says Plutarch, "it is possible to find cities without walls, without letters,

without kings, without wealth, without coin, without schools, without theatres; but a city without a temple, or that practiceth not worship, prayer or the like, no one ever saw." What was true in his day is true now, and it is true now and true ever because there is no living without religion. "If there be not a religious element in the relations of man," says Carlyle, "such relations are miserable and doomed to ruin."

La Place, another great astronomer, makes this confession: "I have lived long enough to know, what I did not at one time believe, that no society can be upheld in happiness and honour without the sentiment of religion." It was with sincere conviction that Voltaire exclaimed, "If God did not exist it would be necessary to invent one," for he recognized the essential nature of religion in the development of human character and the maintenance of human relations. But constantly and forever something within man assures him that God exists; that something is the motive force of all religion, and though reason can advance it, support it and direct it, reason cannot destroy it.

## III

## TRUTH OR ILLUSION

WE HAVE apparently found the evidences of God in the external universe and within our own being. But is this, after all, an illusion? Is the universe in fact solely material? Are we ourselves matter and nothing more? Are we merely complicated mechanisms pulled this way and that by the strings of external "stimuli"? Are our emotions just visceral reactions? Are the emanations that we choose to call "thought" but the incidental outcropping of mechanical titillation or chemical exhalations? Are spirit and mind and consciousness only meaningless words that apply to unrealities, "such stuff as dreams are made on"?

There are highly intelligent men who in effect answer all these questions in the affirmative. And in truth there is much logic in their view. If there were not, philosophers of that conviction could not have kept up the materialistic argument from time immemorial. To the eye

the universe is wholly material. Nothing is visible, nothing is tangible, but matter. Neither the telescope nor the microscope reveals anything else. All life operates in and through matter. The surgeon's knife opens up to view every part of the animate body and finds nothing there but matter. Dissection of the brain has disclosed no "seat of the soul." Disease of that organ unquestionably diseases the mind. Removal of a part of the brain puts an end to the physical or psychical functions which that part governs. That physical conditions influence and sometimes, at least, cause emotions was recognized ages ago. It must be granted that on the basis of observation "we know life only as a quality of and in association with matter."

If it is true, then, as to the eye it seems to be, that the universe is wholly material, that life is a physical, mechanical process, then of course the idea of mind as something other than physical is a delusion, and our conceptions of spirit and spiritual things are vain. But how did we get such an idea and such conceptions? Is it possible that a material instrument can create of itself an immaterial thing? Is it possible that a spiritual thought, or any thought, can emanate from a machine? It is manifest that the brain

as a physical organ will respond in some way to physical impressions or sensations. A mirror reflects what is before it. A camera records the scenes that come within the scope of its lens. The eye is nothing more than an automatically focusing lens that conveys images to the brain, and it can convey nothing but the image of a substance, a material object, something that is visible. The sense of feeling may notify the brain of the presence of something that is not visible. The air about one cannot be seen but it can be felt when it stirs. The sense of smell may tell the brain of something that can neither be seen nor felt. And the ear may bring to the brain sounds of something that can not be seen nor smelled nor felt.

But all these sense impressions that come to the brain are physical, and its responses must be solely physical if it is only a delicate piece of mechanism. What is it that takes the impressions which are registered upon the brain through the senses and turns them into something which is not physical? A thought is not a physical thing; until it is somehow externally expressed it cannot be seen, or heard, or touched; it has no odour; it cannot be weighed or measured; the microscope cannot bring it to view. And yet it

is only by means of this wholly immaterial thing that the materialist himself discovers a universe in which nothing immaterial exists.

It is not to be denied that in human experience the mental processes cannot be carried on apart from their physical medium, the nervous system, but even the conception of an immaterial thing, the mere idea of an immaterial power or an immaterial product, would seem to be utterly beyond the powers of a purely mechanical process. Moreover, thought unquestionably is a force in itself, a force that is superior to all material things, a force that takes matter and does with it as it will, a force that initiates and directs all the creative activities known to man. "The world of material phenomena presupposes a system of immaterial agency."[1] Can it be possible that matter can produce something entirely different from itself, something greater than itself, something which is constantly subjecting matter to its own demands, making matter the servant of its needs?

To say that this is possible is to claim for matter not only an intelligence of its own but an intelligence that continuously and invariably operates for its own subjection. Nowhere in

[1] Stout, *Manual of Psychology.*

nature has there been discovered the slightest evidence of intelligence in matter apart from life. It is only where life is associated with matter that any degree of intelligence is perceivable. But wherever life exists, no matter how low its form, there is at least the germ of that which in its higher forms is called intelligence. There is something in the protoplasmic cell itself which foreshadows the intelligence developed in the complex organisms of man. Even in plants, and plants of the lowest order, there is observed an adaptation to the needs of environment that implies the exercise of a selective faculty. And as animal life increases in the complexity of its organization, there is discernible an increasing intelligence. Intelligence certainly is not inherent in matter alone, nor can it be a product of matter save as matter has been an instrumentality in the development of life.

It is therefore not matter which creates intelligence, but life, operating in association with matter and always superior to matter. Intelligence, that is to say, is an expression of life, of life that by the processes of its own evolution has become more and more dominant over matter though never able to exist or function with-

out it. But what is life? Science confesses that it does not know. In the last hundred years science has amazingly increased the knowledge of the forms and the phenomena of life. It has found that there is a basic unit in all living organisms. But life in that basic cell is just as mysterious, just as incomprehensible, as it is in man, the highest organic expression of life. It is something that in itself is not discoverable by the sense, and none of the marvellous instruments of science can bring it within their range. All its manifestations in matter are observable, but life, it seems, is not matter, but something immaterial that is greater than matter, something that animates matter and uses it for its own ends.

If this is true, then life itself is a denial of materialism. The theory of evolution at first seemed to give strong support to the idea of a purely material universe and the mechanistic conception of life, and there are many who still think it does. But as evolution is studied it appears to be becoming more and more manifest that it is not inconsistent with spiritual conceptions, that on the contrary it discloses an order and method in the processes of creation that is progressive in principle and in effect, that con-

tains the evidences of vast and benevolent purpose, and that reveals a creator in continuous activity, in close and intimate relations with His creations. Evolution seems, indeed, to be a spiritual process, under spiritual direction, for the progressive development of spiritual or immaterial powers, a gradual awakening of a consciousness in life, and a corresponding approach to the nature of its Source.

"What is the process of evolution," says an eminent thinker, "but the effort of life to master completely all lifeless matter? That matter exists to be the medium of expression for life; and life becomes more intense, becomes more completely life, as it masters matter more and more and makes it the medium of expression. Life as we understand it is spirit expressing itself and becoming itself through the mastery of matter."[2] And "I see in the whole evolution of life on our planet," says Bergson, "a crossing of matter by a creative consciousness, an effort to set free, by force of ingenuity and invention, something which in the animal still remains imprisoned and is only finally released when we reach man." Or, to quote another authority: "The evolutionary process of creation with its

[2] Clutton-Brock, "Spirit and Matter," in *The Spirit*.

suggestion of urge or drive in a definite and culminating direction, gives the impression of a Supreme Mind going forth in creative and directive activity, as the result of which physical organizations are built up of ever-increasing complexity suitable for the reception of its ever-increasing influx." [3]

If the theory of evolution furnishes the true explanation of the processes of creation throughout the ages, it but emphasizes the necessity for, and the certainty of, an infinite intelligence operative upon and within the processes. And if it is true it is conclusive evidence that these processes, on the whole, move steadily and irresistibly forward, steadily and irresistibly upward. The descent of man is a descent only in point of time, only in the sense of one's descent from one's ancestors. In qualities, in values, it is a constant ascent of man. It has processively, progressively, raised man from the status of the beast to a spiritual kinship with his creator.

It is the distinctive fact of this ascent that while the physiological changes have been remarkable, they have been inconsiderable in comparison with the advances in man's capacity for the conception and application of spiritual ideas.

[3] Simpson, *Man and the Attainment of Immortality.*

Great as is the physical difference between the Neanderthal man and the man of to-day, the difference in spiritual attributes and their manifestations is far greater. If, then, the theory of evolution demands the assumption of a cause, of a creative intelligence directing it, that intelligence is something superior to matter, something that is not matter, something, in short, that is spiritual; and if the processes of evolution tend constantly to make life superior to matter, to develop consciousness and through consciousness to cause to bud and bloom in increasing profusion the qualities, the sentiments, the ideas, the ideals, the activities, which we term spiritual, it must be, first, that spirit is a reality, second, that spirit is the supreme reality, and, third, that its development is the end toward which creation moves.

When and where and how in this process did life appear? Science does not know, nor does science even now know what life is. Yet there is nothing more certain than that life exists. It distinguishes organic matter from inorganic matter. It is something that enters into matter and transforms it. And it would seem that the whole process of evolution in inorganic nature was at first a preparation for the entry of life

and then a continuation of the process so as to promote the development of life on an ascending scale. Inorganic nature, that is to say, came into existence not for itself apparently, but to be a means to an end, and that end is life.

Through millions of years after it came forth from the womb of the sun, this earth of ours was being made ready for the task of sustaining life, and through succeeding millions of years it has been the agency of a living creation of ever-increasing intensity and power. With such vast preparations we must assume that the object was worthy of the prodigious effort, that life itself has a profound significance in the cosmic process. Yet life, which is everywhere present in this planet, remains, apart from its processes, an unexplained and perhaps never explainable mystery.

If, then, so tremendous a phenomenon, the existence of which is plainly evident to all of our sense perceptions, which we cannot deny without denying our own existence, is an unfathomed mystery, the mere fact that we cannot comprehend is no rational basis for the denial of an attribute of life that seems as well attested by observation and experience as life itself. The mystery of mind is a constant accompaniment of the mystery of life, and the one

is as great a mystery as the other. We cannot account for either except upon the assumption of something in the universe and in life that is not material.

Moreover, this something which in man at least manifests itself in consciousness constantly proclaims its own reality, proclaims it so strongly indeed that not a few have argued persuasively and earnestly that it is the only reality, that matter is the actual illusion. That, however, seems to be as opposed to the feeling and experience of mankind as the contrary view which denies its own consciousness in denying the existence of consciousness. Logic either way cannot overcome man's conviction of his own identity, that he is the same person from birth unto death, however much he may have changed physically or psychically with the passage of time and under the shaping influences of experience; nor the conviction that that identity which he calls "himself" is not a mere thing of flesh and blood and bones and nerves, but something different from and superior to the physical appearances of his identity. The sense or feeling that he is a spiritual entity has dominated man's thinking from the beginning, and that he is mistaken in this and in the conviction that the highest values

of life are also spiritual, is something beyond the powers of science to prove.

"Certain it is that most of the things we think we know well enough to stake our lives upon them were never proved by science and never can be proved by science. That I am I, the same self this morning that went to sleep last night no scientific laboratory ever proved or could prove. That life is worth while, that an exalted friendship is a noble thing, that one loves one's beloved, that some causes are worthy of sacrifice and death, that the Venus de Milo is beautiful—no one ever goes to science for proof of such things. To which of the sciences would one appeal on such a quest? Physics? Astronomy? Sociology? And yet we, including the scientist, act as though we knew such things much better than even the formulas of scientific laboratories. Such truths give their character to whole civilizations. For such truths men are sometimes willing to die, whereas it would be difficult to find a sane person willing to die for the first Law of Motion or a chemical analysis."[4]

Yet if the materialistic theory of life is correct none of these are truths at all. But, again, if that theory is correct, how is it that we not

[4] Hudson, *The Truths We Live By.*

only believe above all things in our spiritual entity, but in the truth and value of such things as are here described which are purely spiritual in their nature? These things are the outcome of consciousness and of those innate tendencies which give urge to conscious activities.

Consciousness is the impregnable wall before which materialism stops and around which it cannot go. "The process of consciousness," says another psychologist, "cannot be analyzed or resolved into such processes as chemical and physical changes in the nerve cells. If consciousness is supposed to be produced by the nervous process the production is simply creation out of nothing. An objection of an equally serious kind is that the materialistic theory destroys all possibility of agency on the part of conscious beings. . . . Materialism makes impossible any real operation of consciousness of any kind whatever." [5] In other words, there can be no such thing as consciousness in a purely mechanistic being, and yet the fact of consciousness is as evident as the fact of life.

Moreover, any fair consideration of the workings of consciousness cannot overlook the transcendent importance of the triumphs of consciousness in

[5] Stout, *Manual of Psychology.*

the realm of spiritual things. The motivating conception of the spirit is the ideal. The ideal is the visioning in consciousness of something that ought to be. Whether it is an ideal of conduct, a way of living; of achievement, a task to be done; of service, an aid to be rendered; of beauty, a height to attain; of ethics, a standard to approach; of truth, a goal to be reached; of religion, a dream to inspire—it is something that animates the consciousness with desire and with more or less endeavour.

Every man has ideals of a sort, even the humblest, or he is strangely lacking, but on the whole the general pull, impetus or trend of the ideal is forward and upward. And the ideal is particularly productive in the spiritual field. Men individually and collectively, set their minds upon conceptions of truth, beauty, excellence or goodness, and in varying degrees are influenced thereby to betterment in thought, conduct, activity and condition. By such ideals most of the ethical progress of mankind has been inspired. They have been the chief factors in the moulding of human character high in quality. They have constantly promoted the development of social relations to equalize the burdens and advance the conditions of men.

Democracy in all its best manifestations is a product of ideals progressively realized though never fully attained. Education is everywhere the outcome of upward-looking and upward-lifting ideals. Art in its varied expressions of beauty and emotion—the delineation of nature and of ideas in painting and sculpture, the inspiring achievements of architecture, the soul-stirring rhythm of poetry and music—is actuated always by the ideal. Culture of every sort, the refinements of all civilization, are the results of ideals that set the standards of what ought to be ever ahead of man's progress. And in religion, of course, the ideal is at once the source, the promoter and the object. In religion, the consciousness rises to its highest conceptions and, in harmony with them, effects the highest achievements in the welfare and advancement of mankind. These are all spiritual ideals, and all that is best and finest in human life, all that makes life worth living, all that gives life meaning and purpose and dignity, is sustained and carried onward and upward by them.

Everything of value, indeed, rests upon the moral law and order which they establish. All the practical activities of life are influenced by them. They are, in truth, indispensable to such

activities. Business could not exist, governments would crumble, society would revert to barbarism, without them. Even science, as another has well said, "could not justify its own existence as serviceable and necessary to life's progress if there were no moral order to interpret what progress means, no realm of things that ought to be which science serves." [6]

Is it rationally conceivable that all this could have been, that all this could now be, or that all this could continue to be, if life were but a mechanical process, and consciousness a mere "by-product of the dance of atoms"? On the contrary, does it not seem clear that although spirit and matter are both realities, interdependent, the supreme reality is that which holds and exercises supremacy, the spirit. The whole history of humanity reveals the dominance, and increasing dominance, of spirit over matter. All that really counts in life—love, friendship, devotion, duty, service, self-sacrifice, morality, righteousness, justice, truth, beauty—are spiritual things. How, then, is it possible that they can be results of mechanical processes of matter that is without sensibility save as life enters into partnership with and vitalizes it? Surely things

[6] Hudson, *The Truths We Live By.*

of the spirit can only be the products of spirit. "The main outstanding fact," says Haldane, "is that the mechanistic account of the universe breaks down completely in connection with the phenomena of life."[7]

The universe, it would seem, is indubitably the creation of an infinite Intelligence, with matter as an agency in the development of life. Apparently the entire process has had as a definite purpose the creation of life, and through life the creation of spirits akin to its source. If there is evidence of law and order and harmony and unity running through the process, there is also the evidence of purpose in the nature and progressiveness of its constant results. Evolution does not contradict this; on the contrary, evolution tends to substantiate it.

"We must confess," says an authority on evolution, "that the general trend of evidence is strongly in favour of a belief in a continuity of process from nebulæ to earth and from cooling earth to awakening life, always supposing, however, that mind is the warp to matter's or electricity's woof, for in the beginning was mind, and that same mind is the light of men."[8] And he

[7] J. S. Haldane, *Mechanism, Life and Personality.*
[8] J. Arthur Thomson, *Concerning Evolution.*

says, "We discern progressiveness in the long history, a movement towards greater integration and differentiation, towards a fuller and freer life, towards more dominance of mind. There are trends in organic evolution which are in the direction of man's highest ideal—truth seeking, beauty and good will." [9]

No one who acknowledges the existence of God even thinks of attributing His existence to the operation of matter. No one presumes to say that in the beginning, or by any process, matter created God. Nor does any one think of attributing the intelligence of God to the reactions of a physical nervous system. To acknowledge the existence of God at all, under any name whatsoever, is to acknowledge the existence of mind, of spirit, in the universe, that is not a product of matter. And if spirit exists anywhere, then it must follow that it exists everywhere that the unmistakable phenomena of spirit are observable. That there is such a thing as creative thought in man is not deniable. At any rate it is not deniable that man creates. And if the universe is the work of a creative intelligence that is not material and could not be material, then it is not only possible that the works of man

[9] *Ibid.*

are products of an intelligence that is not material, but it is incredible that they could be the products of anything but an immaterial intelligence, though in both cases matter is the means by which the creative intelligence is expressed.

Moreover, if it is conceded that God exists and is a spirit and is to be credited with physical creation, then it would seem to be utterly illogical to deny that He is the source of the spiritual as well as the physical qualities of man. It is inconceivable that a spiritual creator of the material world could have no part in the creation of the spiritual qualities and spiritual values of human life whose existence is as certain as, and whose values are far more important than, the physical elements of life. But, on the other hand, if we acknowledge His existence and His spiritual nature, and credit Him with the creation of both substance and spirit, then the relations of spirit and matter are reconcilable, then they are seen to be in harmony with creation and with Him. There is no logical explanation of the spiritual phenomena of human life save in the assumption that man, as was said ages ago, is the " microcosm of God."

## IV

## THE DIVINE CIRCLE

MATTER is not illusion. Nor is spirit an illusion; it cannot be. It is as real as matter. Both exist, and each is essential to the other. There is an inter-relation and an inter-dependence between spirit and matter that give to them a certain unity. And whether there is the same inter-dependence or not, there is apparently the same inter-relation and the same unity in the universe. The spirit that we call God finds expression, so far as we know, only within and by means of the physical body of the cosmos. "As in man so in the universe. The body is the instrument and the expression of the spirit. The physical cosmos is the body of God."[1]

Within the bodies of men, spirit calls to spirit directly, spirit communicates with spirit, spirit encourages, comforts, energizes and inspires spirit, in the innumerable ways that are the common phenomena of daily life. All the spiri-

[1] Leighton, *Religion and the Mind of To-day.*

tual qualities of man are more or less dynamic. They not only influence his own thought and action, but they flow out to influence the thoughts and actions of others. Indeed, the spiritual cannot thrive without communion with the spiritual. Society is largely founded upon and sustained by spiritual relations.

The home is pre-eminently a spiritual institution. It is not at all necessary to the physical requirements of reproduction. Something that is called a home may be a mere lodging, of no more spiritual value than the nests of the birds or the lairs of the beasts; but the real home is the abiding place of love, a place made sacred by the endearing and enduring associations of the family life, a place that is sanctified by devotion, by self-sacrifice, by sympathy, by mutual help, by sorrow and joy, by many things that are all spiritual radiations.

So, too, in all social relations. The higher qualities of human life, the qualities that sustain and promote the associative principles and activities, the qualities that create the real values of association, are spiritual, and they communicate themselves from one to another, permeating society with their influence. It is by means of them that society progresses, that civilization

advances. The ideals of one man, a little in advance of his fellows, become the ideals of a group and gradually of the mass, and slowly are given concrete expression in action. This process goes on continuously, and always it is by means of communication of spirit to spirit, through the physical senses to be sure, but only using them as agencies of transmission for spiritual ideas.

But if all this is true, spirit must be something other than a function of matter, must be something more than a form of energy, must be something more than a mental process. It is energy and it is intelligence, but it is still more than either or than both combined. For these are but attributes of the spirit, not the spirit itself. They pertain to a self, an ego, a personality. The phenomena of the spirit arise always from personality, they grow out of the self. In man's own consciousness the spirit is inherent in self, it is self. He feels that the spirit which is self is superior to and dominates his physical being, that soul is greater than body. This feeling has been a conviction that no philosophical abstractions, however plausible, have ever persuaded him to abandon, for within him was constant assertion of the spirit, constant contra-

diction of the denial of spirit. That feeling apparently has always existed.

"It would seem," says McDougall, "that from a very remote period men of almost all races have entertained the belief that the living man differs from the corpse in that his body contains some subtle thing or principle which determines his purposive movements, its growth and self-repair, and to which is due his capacity for sensation, thought and feeling. For the belief in some such animating principle, or soul, is held by almost every existing race of men, no matter how lowly the grade of their culture nor how limited their mental powers; and we find evidences of similar beliefs among the earliest human records." [2]

Primitive animism, to be sure, expressed itself in many ideas manifestly false and in superstitions that have been rejected, but the sense of some mysterious quality of the personality that is not of the flesh and that is superior to the flesh, upon which ignorance and crude intelligence based such superstitions, is the same sense that is active in the personality of man to-day, and that defies all attempts to eliminate it. Man feels, and believes that he knows, from

[2] McDougall, *Body and Mind.*

his feeling, his consciousness, his experience, that he is essentially a spiritual being, a unitary soul that is confined to a physical body, and constantly shaped by physical experience but not in itself physical. He can identify that soul with his consciousness but he cannot identify it with his body.

In that instinctive conviction, which both reason and experience support, that personality is immaterial, spiritual, man more or less vaguely realizes a relationship in himself to the spiritual Intelligence which directs the universe. If the material universe is the product of forces put into action, and kept in action, by an immaterial Intelligence, and if the crowning result of that process is man, in whom the spiritual qualities are dominant, then it must be that man's spirit came from the same source and that the spirit of man is the supreme product of the process.

For it appears that creation, in so far as it can be observed on this planet, has man for its goal, and if this appearance is reality, it is inconceivable that the only thing which elevates man above the beast can be but a fortuitous incident of the process of creation. It cannot be that the intelligence which created matter did not

also create spirit with the same deliberate intent. And, manifestly, if this infinite spiritual Intelligence created man with a spiritual intelligence, then it placed at the summit of creation something akin to itself, something in its own image, something that has within it potentially the qualities of the divinity from which it came. So, if this is true, man's intuitive sense of spiritual being, and his intuitive sense of relationship with divinity, spring from the facts of his existence.

If, then, there is this likeness and relationship between man and his creator, and if spirit calls to spirit from man to man, there must be some spiritual communion between man and God. That there is such a communion, however inarticulate it may be, is attested by the experience of mankind throughout the ages, a communion that has been the soul of religion in all times. And surely if divinity can manifest itself in matter it can manifest itself in spirit, which is its own peculiar element, as well.

Moreover, if we concede that creation is the work of a spiritual Intelligence, and that man is a spiritual being, there is a fundamental link missing in the system if there is no connection between the spirit of the one and the other.

The whole thing is lacking in that reason, order and harmony which is characteristic of creation generally if that connection does not exist. Therefore it must exist, and, as has been said, the experience of mankind is evidence that it does exist.

"The religious phenomena," says William James, "has shown itself to consist everywhere, and in all stages, in the consciousness which individuals have of an intercourse between themselves and higher powers with which they feel themselves to be related."[3] It is, indeed, upon that consciousness that all ideas of religion are founded. And it is by and through this intercourse that the higher spiritual qualities of life are sustained and developed. It is because of it, and solely because of it, that the soul of man constantly aspires to better things, constantly conceives the ought to be and seeks to ascend to it. It is because of it that the soul of man lifts its eyes from the ground to the stars, and fixes a goal beyond the limits of the finite. And it is because of it that through all the ages man has intuitively expressed the longings of his soul in prayer.

It is the consciousness of an intercourse with

[3] James, *Varieties of Religious Experience.*

something infinitely superior, to which none the less it feels related. All matter is related by the common basis of its structure, and the uniformity of the basic elements of nature throughout the universe, in so far as they are observable by man, indicate that this relationship has no boundaries. It may be assumed, therefore, that all spirit is related. Certainly the spirit of all men appears to be fundamentally the same, however various its manifestations, and if the structure of matter is basically the same wherever it exists, whether in the earth or in the remotest star, it is a reasonable presumption that the nature of spirit is similarly uniform.

We may reasonably assume, that is to say, that the spirit associated with life is the same, whether it is found on our planet, or conceivably on a sphere at the remotest space of the universe, if the universe has any limitation at all, and that this spirit, wherever found, is related to the spirit of divinity—in brief, that the spirit of man is of the same stuff as the spirit of God. It is in this particular that we are justified in feeling that we are, indeed, children of God.

Moreover, it is in this relation, and only in this relation, that a rational meaning and purpose are discernible in human existence. "The

world," says Marcus Aurelius, "is either a welter of alternate combination and dispersion or a unity of order and providence. If the former, why do I care about anything else than how I shall at last become earth? But, on the other alternative, I reverence, I stand steadfast, I find heart in the power that disposes all." If we are but animated machines operating in a purely material universe what matters anything but the physical comforts and pleasures of the moment?

Life for a machine has no obligations, no responsibilities, no morality, no truth, no goodness, no conscience, no hope. These are, then, but illusions. If this is true, there is no real distinction between man and the rocks or between man and the beasts of the field. But if man is a spirit, and as spirit a son of God, everything matters; for in that case a reason for life is perceivable; it becomes imbued with meaning, with purpose; the intelligence that is discernible in all creation is then to be observed in the scheme of human life, which thereby becomes consistent with the general order and harmony of the universe. Man, as the crown of creation, comes into contact with God and completes the circle of being. Without that contact of com-

pletion life and all that led to it would be aimless futility.

But what, then, is the reason for life that is perceivable? It is the concern of God in the creation of intelligent spirits in likeness to Himself through the shaping processes of a material experience. Life, that is to say, is a means of soul-making. Science sees in the long, deliberate and infinitely patient evolution of inorganic matter on this planet a preparation for organic life, and in the equally deliberate and patient development of life upward to man a process of progressive creation with man as its ultimate flower. If this view of science is correct, it gives a vast importance hitherto inconceivable to the creation of man and to his place in the universe. And if the highest qualities of man are spiritual, it seems obvious that the evolution of the spirit within man is the goal toward which the whole process of creation has constantly moved.

In this view human life assumes a tremendous significance. To have required such incalculable time, such elaborate preparations and such complicated processes, it must have an inestimable value in the regard of the Creator. And there is but one conceivable attribute of divinity that could give reason and urge to so vast an accom-

plishment or that could hold its purpose in such high esteem. That attribute is Love. For there is no other imaginable incentive that is compatible with a rational conception of deity.

Creation, if purposive at all, must have a purpose commensurate with the prodigious structure it erects. If its goal is spiritual, its ends must be spiritual, and as the spiritual outcome of creation is manifested only in man, and as in man love is by far the highest expression, the transcendent ultimate, of all the finest spiritual qualities within him, it must be that love is the supreme spiritual product of creation, the culminating achievement of the process. That love in the relations of man with man is the loftiest expression of his being is not to be questioned, and that in this expression, and in this alone, he approaches nearest to the best conception of divinity, is no less certain. That being beyond doubt, it must be that it is love that raises man to the likeness of God, and if that is true, then God must be Love indeed.

But there can be no love without something to love. Love must have an object. Moreover, love demands love in return. It cannot be satisfied with a one way expression. It gives of necessity, for it is only in giving that it can

manifest itself; but it must also receive, for love is not complete unless it is somehow reciprocal. These are characteristic of love as we know it in man, and if God is love it must be assumed that the characteristics of love in Him must be the same, except, of course, that our love, beautiful as it may be in its purest and deepest expression, can be but a spark in comparison with the divine flame of infinity. If this be so, then we can perceive a reason for the creation of souls in the yearning of the Supreme Intelligence for intelligent objects of love capable of returning His love. "The whole meaning of creation is seen to be the origination of conscious spirits, for to them alone can God reveal Himself, and from them alone can He obtain response. Everything else, the whole material fabric, is but God's medium, as it were, for the shaping of souls."[4]

"God is love," says John, "and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him." Thus by love the great circle, which comprehends the grand sweep of creation, brings God and man into contact and communication. The thought may be expressed more simply by this illustration. When the child at school reaches the verb,

[4] Seth Pringle-Patterson, *The Spirit.*

in the study of grammar, usually the first one he learns to conjugate is "to be." This is the supreme verb of life, for it is life. Being is existence, and the one word sums up all that existence implies. And as the nature of existence varies with each individual, so, curiously, the form of the verb varies, in English, for each person in the singular. "I am, thou art, he is." "I am." Thus in two words and three letters I declare myself, my existence, my identity, my personality. "Thou art." So I give acknowledgment to your existence and identity. "He is." In this utterance I include the whole of humanity in my recognition, each individual separately.

Now let us put the conjugation this way: "I am, thou art, He is." We have here connected God and man, the finite and the infinite, in an eternal circle. The Supreme Being, the totality of life, the source of all life. I am, because He is. Thou art because He is. The golden finger of divinity reaches out and touches me; it reaches out and touches you; I clasp your hand and the circle is complete. Herein is expressed the relations between man and man, and between man and God. You are my brother; I am yours; He is our Father. In the recognition of these facts

lies the essentials of religion. When one of the Scribes came to Jesus and asked which is the first commandment of all, Jesus answered: "The first of all the commandments is, 'Hear O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength.' This is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' There is none other commandment greater than these."

God is love. His love flows out to me, it flows out no less to you. But unless it flows from me to you, and from you to me, and from both back again to Him, the circuit of the divine current is not complete in our individual cases. Unquestionably love between man and man is a constant and pervasive influence in human existence. Indeed, the man who does not love and who is not beloved, the man who does not feel in some degree the sentiment of love toward some object, who does not express some degree of love in one or more of its many forms of expression, or who himself is not the recipient of love from some other being, is exceedingly rare, if he exists at all.

Love is virtually universal in the world of humanity. It is no less certain that from man collectively there goes out a large measure of love toward God, far more than is consciously expressed or consciously realized. For undoubtedly there are times in the lives of most men, however godless, when there is felt a sentiment toward divinity, a sense of dependence or of thankfulness, that is the soul's unconscious expression of love. Moreover, there are millions of men who, unknown to their fellows, bear within their hearts a deep and abiding love for God, of which they are fully conscious. Man's love for God is not to be measured by its formal expressions. And if God is love the divine love must be pouring out upon man, upon all men, continuously. For love is necessarily objective. It can exist only in relation to its objects, and inasmuch as all men are products of His creation, which has for its purpose the development of souls for His love, it follows that all men are His children and His love goes out to all.

Thus, love, the power that sways the universe, binds God to man and man to God, forming the circle of a dynamic current which brings the finite and the infinite into intimate

relation, and lifts human life into the exalted sphere of divinity. And thus the purpose of the timeless sweep of creation, the prodigious labours of the whole creative process, finds magnificent justification.

## V

## THE HUMANITY OF GOD

MEN are the recipients of God's love because He has made them conscious spirits like Himself, because He has made them in His own image, because they are in truth His children. But if they have the likeness of God then manifestly God has the likeness of man. And if we may speak of the divinity of man, there is a sense in which we may speak of the humanity of God. We can be His children only as His likeness is expressed in us, and He can be our Father only as we can perceive that likeness to ourselves in Him.

We cannot conceive of any attributes of God that are not also attributes of man in an infinitely less degree. Whatever is best in man, we may assume to be a reflection of that which is in God. We say that God is love, and reason and feeling tell us that this must be true. Indeed, we think it must be true that love is more than an attribute of God, that it is His essence, His being, that if God is love, then love is God,

and that therefore all His attributes are the attributes of love.

We cannot have any conception of God superior to this, for it transcends any other idea possible to the human mind. But love is an attribute of man, the highest attribute; and man, we may well believe, comes into closest likeness with God when love most nearly dominates his being. It is therefore something that we know, something that we understand. We are more or less conscious of love constantly in ourselves, and we see examples of its expression about us every day. So that love is no metaphysical abstraction, but something real, a concrete force, with which we are familiar. And we feel that God's love is in essence something like to our own love, however it may differ in magnitude, in purity and in power. If, then, in love we are like to Him, in love He is like to us. Love is our heritage from Him, something of Himself which He gives to us.

But conception of God as love has come to man only as his intelligence has been so refined, his intuitions so exalted, as to make that conception possible. Historically man has thought of God, first of all, as a Creator. The first words in the most sacred of books presents a vision of

God in the act of creation. And all through human history God has been regarded primarily as the maker of the universe, while to-day He is conceived as constantly engaged in the work of creation. In this, as in no other way, His power is made manifest to the eye.

But man also is a creator. In making man in His own image God gave him, alone of all His works, the creative impulses and the creative powers. And man's creative faculties and his creative material achievements have increased with the knowledge he has progressively acquired of means and methods of creation. By the exercise of these faculties he has built great cities and reclaimed deserts, he has spanned the land and the sea with agencies of transportation, he has conquered the air, he has, through the instruments of science, brought the universe into the field of his vision and study, and marvellously advanced his acquaintance with the processes of life; he has brought the products of the supreme creation largely into his service; he has made light and heat and sound do his bidding; he has extracted from the earth the materials for vast and varied construction; and in art and literature he has exercised his creative powers in their highest functions.

We think of God as a being of infinite power, omnipotent. Yet man within his finite limitations possesses and uses wondrous power that God has given him through the intelligence with which he is endowed. This power is manifested in all the material creations just mentioned as the power of God is manifested in his physical creation, and similarly it brings into existence forms and processes of potency and of beauty that constantly indicate his likeness and relation to the Supreme Creator. Not only does he exercise a material power but a spiritual power that is used to advance the social welfare and that in the measure of its application with true understanding of its nature and purpose helps to lift mankind closer to the divine.

In the right exercise of this spiritual power he brings into play all the godlike attributes of love, justice, mercy, integrity, patience. No rational conception of God can regard Him as lacking in these qualities which in human life are to be found at their best in the best of man. In short, whether we conceive God as love, as creator, as power, as infinite wisdom, as truth, as the perfection of every imaginable virtue, we cannot ascribe to him any quality or attribute which is not also a quality or attribute of man,

however small its relative measure. Indeed, it is only because these qualities exist in man that he can arrive at the conception of a God having them, and who is their source. And always man's idea of God has been refined and elevated as these qualities have had the highest development and expression within himself.

If God is an intelligence, He thinks; if He is love, He feels; if He is constantly engaged in creating, He labours; if He has, and gives expression to, the attributes we ascribe to Him, there are in His being the essentials of personality. And these are the essentials of personality in man. Eliminate them from man and he ceases to be man and becomes a beast. It is only as we possess and employ these attributes that we rise above the level of the animal, and it is only as we possess and employ them that we take on the likeness of God. They are the attributes and functions of mind and spirit, the peculiar attributes that alone distinguish man from the rest of creation, and they are the qualities which we must ascribe to God if we accept His existence and perfection.

What, then, is the difference between man and God? Is it not apparent that it is a difference of degree and not of kind? Are there any

conceivable spiritual differences that are not differences of degree? The degree, to be sure, is immeasurable, but the likeness and relation must be there, because we cannot imagine any quality in Him that we do not possess ourselves, in microscopic proportions, and grossly alloyed as a rule, but none the less existing within us. There is a vast difference between the grain of sand and the towering mountains, but the sand came from the mountain and is of the same stuff. A cup of water from the sea is nothing in comparison with the boundless ocean, but its elements are the same. And man, we may well believe, comes from God and is spiritually of the same stuff as He.

How, indeed, can we regard Him as our Father if we are not His children, how can we be His children if we are not like to Him, and how can He be our Father unless He is like to us? It is only in the likeness that such a relation can exist. This conception of God does not diminish Him in the least. On the contrary, it gives Him greater glory, for it brings Him nearer, makes His glory more clearly visible, just as the instruments of science bring the orbs of the heavens nearer and vastly augment their splendour.

On the other hand, it exalts man immeasurably. For if God is his father in truth, then man denies his heritage when he regards himself as a "worm in the dust," an abject slave, and grovels at the feet of deity; when in fact he is a prince of the house of God, a member of the highest nobility of the universe, and worthy to stand in the presence of his Father, confident and unafraid, unless he has rendered himself unworthy by his own conduct, unless, indeed, he has wilfully sacrificed his birthright.

Moreover, if he is like unto God and God is like unto him, if their relations are that of Father and Son, they are brought into the comprehensible and endearing associations of the closest kinship. For man knows the meaning of fatherhood. It is no mystical relation, but something familiar to his observation and experience. He knows that fatherhood in its highest expression is love, tenderness, sympathy, mercy, patience, justice. He knows the love, the trust, the reverence of the worthy son for such a father, and its intimate and endearing companionship. And knowing all this, he is enabled to understand the nature of the Supreme Father and his own relation to Him. The humanity of God and the divinity of man bring them near to-

gether in likeness and in kinship, make them Father and Son in truth, and give to the existence of man a supernal meaning and a purpose commensurate with the stupendous design and the infinitely patient labours of creation.

## VI

## GOD IN MAN

THE transcendent conception of the fatherhood of God, the idea which brings Him into close and intimate relation with man, and expresses the most beautiful and profound likeness and kinship of God and man, we owe to One who in His own person so embodied the qualities of God that He stands unique in the records of human history. If man has all the conceivable qualities of God, though in microscopic measure and exceedingly imperfect, then God must have the superior qualities of man in infinite perfection.

If this be true, and if we can imagine God taking to Himself the physical likeness of man, we must expect to see Him giving expression to the virtues with which we are acquainted but in a purity and perfection unknown to us and unattainable by us. God, that is to say, so embodied would be a being whom we could comprehend, whom we could recognize as like unto us, One with whom we could enter into mutual

association with an assurance that He would understand us, though in all His attributes He would be so far superior to us that He would command our reverence and worship by the very perfection of His personality.

If a being of such perfection has existed, He is at least a manifestation of the conceivable attributes of God within the form of man, a visible revelation of the nature of God, brought within the compass of man's view and understanding. That such a being has existed, and does exist, in the person of Jesus Christ, is the Christian conviction, and it is because of His incomparable perfection as a man that He realizes the highest conception of God embodied and revealed to the eye, the mind and the heart. We cannot imagine a perfect God being other than a perfect man, if the God chooses to reveal Himself to the human vision and understanding. For no qualities of a perfect God are imaginable, we repeat, that are not found in embryo, or more or less feebly expressed, in mankind. And in Jesus alone of all mankind is found that perfection of manhood which can illustrate and exemplify the conception of the perfect God.

Was there such a man as Jesus? We are often told that the idea of God is a delusion, and it is

sometimes, though rarely, argued that Jesus is a myth. But though myths gathered about His person, as the apocryphal writings show, no fact of equal remoteness is better attested than the physical existence of Jesus. And certainly no historical character of any time has been more vividly and convincingly portrayed. The synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, are contemporary records, written soon after the death of Jesus, by men who either knew Jesus personally or who derived their information directly from persons who had been associated with Him. All three writers obviously drew largely upon records of incidents and sayings that had been set down probably during the lifetime of Jesus, certainly not much later, inasmuch as they necessarily preceded the writing of the Gospels.

That these documents were produced in the period closely following the circumstances they record is unquestionable, and that they contain the literal testimony of actual eye-witnesses of the occurrences and hearers of the sayings recorded is strongly indicated by the nature of the records. The writers of the books of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are primarily reporters, influenced by their different viewpoints, which more or less colour their reports, but chiefly concerned

in presenting the facts of the "good news" it was their task to record. It matters not that their identity is debatable, the fidelity of their reports is manifest. The Gospel of John is of a different order. It is plainly of somewhat later origin and the writing is less journalistic and more philosophical than the synoptic gospels, but factually it is in general harmony with the others.

In these reportorial chronicles is clearly depicted a personality it would be impossible to invent. The One whom they present is unique in human history. The idea of the perfect man is not difficult to conceive in the abstract, but to give concrete and convincing expression to the idea in an imaginative creature would be a task that the most exalted literary genius would hesitate to undertake. That four simple men, or for that matter, four men of any degree of literary ability, could have successfully created a personality of that character, and that personality in all essential particulars the same in each case, is inconceivable, unless the man whom they described actually existed. And they not only depict such a personality of incomparable character but they attach to him a system of religion and ethics that on the whole is also unique in

the spiritual experience of mankind. Moreover, this personality and the system associated with it has impressed the intelligence and the feeling of the world for two thousand years as nothing else has impressed it. That all this, this man, this religion, this influence, could be the product of imagination is utterly incredible.

However, the testimony of the Gospels does not stand alone. The letters of Paul, written before the Gospels, bear in every line not only the evidence of their genuineness as epistolary communications to existing congregations, but the evidence of their immediate relation to the time and the circumstances of the life of Jesus. They, together with the Acts of the Apostles, reveal the rapid development of a religious cult based upon the reality of the existence of Jesus. Paul, to be sure, founded his preaching largely upon the death and resurrection of Jesus, with the spiritual implications of those events, but none the less they referred to the essential fact of a living Christ, a physical being, a man, whose death was a recent occurrence, within the period of Paul's own life; and if Paul had had no direct personal contact with Him, he had the acquaintance of many who did know Him and of not a few, such as Peter and John, who had been in-

timately associated with Him. So also the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistles of John, Peter and James are similarly based upon a real, living, human personality. "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you," said John, and indeed the whole of the New Testament is inexplicable upon any other foundation.

Moreover, the amazing spread of the Christian religion to all parts of the Roman empire within a very few years after the crucifixion of Jesus, a religion based upon the personality of Jesus Christ and dependent wholly upon the reality of His existence, is a historical fact that is beyond doubt. The letters of Paul present evidence of the establishment of congregations in Asia Minor, in Greece and in Italy when the death of Christ was still an event of but yesterday and many were yet living who had "seen and heard" Him. The references of the Roman historians Suetonius and Tacitus, and Pliny the younger, indicate the rapid growth of the followers of Jesus, and though casual give substantial support to the evidence of the Epistles as to this development.

It was in A. D. 64, only thirty-four or thirty-five years after the crucifixion, that Nero persecuted the Christians in Rome, the first of many perse-

cutions, the fact being proof that even at this early date the sect had attracted attention in the capital by its numbers, its activities, and its peculiar belief. Nero, says Tacitus, "inflicted cruel tortures on men hated for their crimes, called by the vulgar Christians. Christ, from whom they took their name, had been put to death under Tiberius by the procurator Pontius Pilate."

It is certain that Christianity was established in virtually all of the centres of population throughout the Roman empire by the end of the first century, or within seventy years after the crucifixion, and all upon the profound conviction of the reality of the man who had but recently lived in Palestine and there had been put to death on the cross. In view of all the records and the circumstances it is impossible that the basis of this religious development could have been a delusion.

The personality depicted in the Gospels must therefore be genuine, and because it would be impossible to imagine and convincingly to portray a personality of such unique perfection, of such perfect humanity and perfect divinity, it must be a true portrait. "The conception of the God-man which is embodied in the portrait which

the sources draw of Christ, and which is dramatized by them through such a history as they depict, can be accounted for only on the assumption that such a God-man actually lived, was seen of men, and was painted from the life. The miracle of the invention of such a portraiture . . . would be as great as the actual existence of such a person. . . . Its very existence in their unsophisticated narratives is sufficient proof of its faithfulness to a great reality."[1]

If the portrait is a true portrait, as for these reasons it must be, the materials which compose it must be substantially true. Truth cannot be expressed by means of falsehood. There may be errors in the delineation, but manifestly the essential outlines must be true to the life or such an effect of vivid reality could not have been accomplished. Jesus Christ, in short, must have lived, He must have been such a man as He is described, and He must have given voice to such conceptions of religion and of ethics as are recorded, because His words, His thoughts, His ideas, are as essential to the portraiture of the personality that is revealed as are His acts.

This personality expresses the qualities we have attributed to God in the highest degree of

[1] Benj. W. Bacon, *Cyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.*

perfection that would appear to be possible when exercised within the limitations of a human life. "I find in him no fault at all," said Pilate, nor has any one seen fault in Him in all the twenty centuries since. He has been discussed, analyzed, dissected, as no other being has ever been; the profoundest intellects of the ages have studied Him critically; but the verdict of mankind, friend and foe, worshipper and sceptic, is unanimous in this particular. No higher or more moving tributes to the beauty and perfection of His personality have been paid than have come from men whom Christians regard as heretics or infidels.

It is in this unique perfection of manhood that He justifies the claims of His divinity, for in that perfection we can discern the practical workings of the attributes which we must ascribe to God in any rational conception of His nature, operating within the form of man and within the sphere of human relations. And if God and man are Father and Son, the son reflecting, however weakly and imperfectly, something of the divinity of the sire, how is that likeness and kinship to be practically expressed, how is that relation to be comprehensibly revealed, unless God manifests Himself in man, and makes His divinity visible through His humanity?

We look upon the stars and are impressed with the might and majesty of their Maker. We look upon the work of nature in this world of ours with varied emotions of awe and wonder. But the marvels of inorganic nature tell us little of their Author. It is only in life that we can begin to discover something of His qualities, and it is only in human life that the Spirit which is God can reveal its character because it is only in human life that His spirit is made manifest. Yet even so, though the spark of divinity is within man, divinity on the scale of the deity is utterly beyond his comprehension save as it is brought within the compass of his vision by its reduction to human ratios. We can understand God, that is to say, only as we can discern His humanity, His likeness to ourselves and our likeness to Him; and that likeness can be made clear only by its embodiment in human form. "He that knoweth me knoweth the Father," said Jesus, and truly in Him is provided a glass through which God may be seen, as it were, face to face, the deity expressed in the perfection of manhood.

Similarly, there can be no satisfactory understanding of the divinity of Jesus save through the doorway of His humanity. He was first of all a man. That is the basic fact of His exis-

tence and of the influence of His personality upon mankind. The Gospel records contain the biography of a man from birth to death, one who was subject to the common feelings and experiences of human life, one who knew what it was to labour, to hunger, to thirst; one who knew joy and sorrow, pleasure and pain; one whom men can recognize as one of their own kind, a brother, companion, friend. Yet when one measures oneself against the consummate perfection of that humanity and realizes the exalted heights to which it reaches in Jesus; when one contemplates the irresistible progress of His personality through the ages and over the wide reaches of the earth; when one considers the influence He has exercised in the development of civilization and the promotion of human welfare; when one observes the supreme miracle of His ever-increasing vitality and power, the mind and heart bow before the divinity therein expressed in terms of human understanding.

Of all men who have lived since human life began on this planet Jesus alone is without fault, and in Him alone the humanity of God is revealed in all the strength and all the purity of the highest conception of deity. Therefore to know Him is in truth to know God. More than that, to

know Him is to know the possibilities of the divinity within all men. For Jesus not only shows what God in man is, but what man in the ultimate perfection of the godlike attributes within Him may be.

## VII

## JESUS THE REVEALER

NOW, in detail, are the humanity of God and the divinity of man revealed in the personality of Jesus? If we have found the evidences of God in the processes of nature generally, we have found them no less, or rather far more, in the particular processes of man's development. The largest proof of God, that is to say, is the creation of a being capable of the conception of a God and endowed with an intuitive sense of deity which compels him to search for God. It is through himself, therefore, through the operation of his own instincts and the exercise of his own intelligence, that man discovers God, and it is thus that God reveals Himself to man. Obviously man could have no knowledge of God save as God is revealed to his senses, his reason, his feeling, and that revelation is necessarily restricted to man's capacity to receive it.

Accordingly, we find that man's idea of God has broadened as his powers have been ex-

panded in the processes of time, and that everywhere and in all ages it has been through individuals of larger capacity for spiritual discernment than the mass that the discovery of God has been promoted. God has always revealed Himself to man in general through particular men. Though they may have seen Him "as through a glass darkly" they none the less saw Him with clearer vision than others of their time, and by imparting their observations made them the advanced views of their people or their age. All great religions have had their origin in leaders of such spiritual discernment, and in all are to be found glimpses at least of a reality which man at last has come to see plainly in the incomparable personality of the man Jesus.

Jesus seems in fact to be a revelation of God because, first of all, He evidently felt Himself to be, and actually declared Himself to be, such a revelation. "The Father hath sent me," He said. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." And such a claim as this would be obviously preposterous were it not that He justified it in the perfection of His person. That He expressed within Himself the highest conceivable attributes of God embodied in man is unquestionable. Nearly two thousand years of intensive

critical study of Jesus, with all the progress man has made in knowledge, has not altered the common verdict of mankind as to the unique perfection of His character. On the contrary, time with all its accumulation of learning, with all its advance in methods of research and criticism, has seemed only to bring that personality in clearer relief against the failings of human nature in general, and to emphasize its perfection.

Moreover, not even the prejudices of different and opposing faiths can overcome this judgment. Whatever the objections to Christianity may be, men of all faiths and of none have uniformly paid tribute to the person of Jesus. The Mahometans, who have hated and have battled with Christianity as their supreme foe, have always regarded Jesus Himself with reverence. Even the Jews, who for centuries have been cruelly and unjustly persecuted in the name of Christ, and who of all people have most reason for antipathy toward Christianity, extol the character of the man.

There is no miracle ascribed to Jesus in the Gospel records comparable with the miracle of His personality, the unchanging judgment of mankind as to its perfection, and its constant and ever-growing influence upon the thought and

conduct of humanity. Not even the numerous and enormous mistakes of those who believed themselves to be working for His cause, not even the long series of crimes committed in His name, have dimmed the lustre of His person. Almost twenty centuries have passed since He lived as a man, an humble inhabitant of a relatively obscure province, making no impress during His life upon the history or learning of the Roman world, His followers for the greater part as lowly as Himself, giving but three or four years to a ministry that covered but a few square miles of territory, dying a felon's death while still but little more than a youth, leaving not a word of His own writing, His memory surviving only in the hearts and minds of a little band of believers.

Yet, to-day, He is loved and worshipped by hundreds of millions. Nations have arisen and decayed, creeds innumerable have had their day and have passed, civilization has spread from the shores of the Mediterranean to encompass most of the world, forms of government have been radically altered, social conditions have changed, education has become almost universal, science has made profound discoveries of facts unsuspected in His day, tremendous forces of nature

have been harnessed and put to work, thought has advanced immeasurably in scope and, for the generality of mankind, in depth; yet the simple man of Galilee is as far above and ahead of humanity as He was twenty centuries ago. This is the supreme miracle of Jesus Christ, and the reality of it is not questionable.

In view of this, the claim of Jesus that He was peculiarly representative of God is entitled to respect, and His authority to speak in the name of God becomes credible. Moreover, His view of the nature of God, strange as it was in His time, is one that is in harmony with the independent reasoning of modern intelligence. At any rate, modern thought finds nothing in the idea of God as presented by Jesus that disagrees with modern knowledge, though some thinkers, now as ever, may reject any and every idea of God. More than that, no one has ever formed a conception of God at once so exalted, so appealing and so convincing.

The idea of the fatherhood of God is the distinctive, and the supreme, contribution of Jesus to the world, and upon that idea all His teaching is based. The idea of God as the father of men, and necessarily of men as the sons of the Father; the idea of God as love, as a father who loves

and who desires to be loved by His children, finds instinctive response in the heart, and rational approval in the mind of man. It must be so because no other idea so conforms to the feeling and the reason of man, no other so fittingly expresses the spiritual relation that must exist between man and the deity, and no other so comprehends the exercise of the divine attributes which we must ascribe to God if we are to regard Him as infinite perfection, as we are compelled to regard Him unless we reject Him completely. Jesus, in short, the uniquely perfect man, gave to mankind the uniquely perfect idea of God, an idea around which all religious thought has revolved, as planets revolve around the sun, through the succeeding centuries.

Here is a man whose personality has impressed mankind as no other in all history, who alone among the sons of men is without discernible fault, whose profound but simple wisdom has been the constant admiration of the ages, who has been a tremendous influence in the social progress of humanity, who has given man an exalted, inspiring and rational conception of God, who declares Himself to be at one with God, "I am in the Father and the Father in me," and who speaks "as one having authority."

What is to be thought of this man? He was, and He is. He is a positive, concrete reality. Is He an impostor? No one so charges. Is He a deluded fanatic? It is impossible that a deluded fanatic could have been what He was, could be what He is, could have done what He has done. Then is He what He says He is? He must be, for it is only in that assumption that He is explicable at all. Therefore, it must be that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the Elder Brother of us all, the voice and the embodiment of God, the visible expression of His divinity and the perfect exemplar of His humanity.

The manhood of Jesus makes this possible. It is the manhood of Jesus alone that makes His personality tangible, and it is that alone that brings Him and all that He represents and expresses within the scope of human understanding. "The manhood of Jesus is a manhood essentially one with ours. His life is a distinctively human phenomenon, moving always within the lines of an authentically human mind and will, and constituting thus a revelation of God in humanity."[1] But obviously there could be no revelation of God in humanity unless the nature of God could be expressed in terms of humanity.

[1] Mackintosh, *The Person of Christ.*

If Jesus is a revelation of God, it must be that the attributes of God can not only find expression in man but that they are attributes which man recognizes as his own. It is indeed as if God said, "If you want to know Me, look at this man; what He is I am; and what He is you are potentially. I am your Father and you are My children. Follow Him and find Me." That, in effect, is the saying of Jesus, "I am in my Father and ye in me and I in you."

The humanity of God is expressed in Jesus, and in Him also is expressed the divinity of man. For it is in His humanity that the divinity of Jesus is revealed, and surely men cannot be the children of God, and cannot be like to Him, unless they partake of that divinity in some degree. Something of God must rest within each and every man, if he is in fact a son, and that something cannot be less than divine, God being its source.

In physical nature, then, we have found the evidences of God expressed in creative power. In our intuitive feelings we have found the evidences of God expressed in spiritual promptings. These alone supply the assurance of the existence of God, constantly in action, constantly in association with His creation and in intimate association

with man, His crowning work, in whose consciousness He finds a response to that love which is His essence. But it is in the personality of Jesus Christ that His nature is fully revealed, it is only through the glass of that personality that we can see Him as it were face to face and know Him for what He is, recognizing our own lineaments, and perceiving His fatherhood.

"No system of knowledge can bring to light the inner nature of the Eternal Heart. Only experience will suffice for that, and an experience of it is possible only if God Himself breaks through somewhere in the universe and reveals the heart we seek in a life we can appreciate and interpret. Christ is the place in the universe where God Himself breaks through and shows the power of love in full operation—not as storm and thunder, not as fire and earthquake, but as love, that suffers long and is kind and will not let go." [2]

Yet all this is objective. Even the instinctive feelings that we have discussed refer in the main to a God without. It is only as we find God within, as we realize that the divinity in man is a bit of God Himself residing in each human heart, that we are put in the way of knowing

[2] Rufus M. Jones, *The World Within.*

God intimately. It is then that we can understand the divine emotions that occasionally rise within us, it is then that we can understand the source of our high aspirations, the constant demand for truth, the irresistible urge toward something better that ought to be; it is then that the whisperings of conscience become something more than vague suggestions from the mind.

With the realization of that divinity each of us becomes a temple of God, wherein He is enshrined. We may ignore Him, we may despoil His temple, but we cannot eject Him. "The Kingdom of God is within you," said Jesus, and in these words He condensed the superstructure of the religion He taught, the fatherhood of God being its foundation. "The hour in which He uttered them witnessed the birth of Christianity," [3] says an eminent historian of religion, and in truth they are the words which give force and meaning not only to Christianity but to all human existence.

For the "Kingdom of God within" man expresses the direct and intimate relation between man and God, it intimates that that relation is one of development of the divine attributes in

[3] Mackintosh, *The Natural History of the Christian Religion.*

the individual man to an increasing likeness to the attributes of God, it signifies soul growth through the shaping influences of experience and the volitional culture of inner virtues, it means the recognition by the soul of its kinship to its source and the lifting of its eyes to God as the flower turns its face to the sun. That recognition is religion pure and simple, and as it manifests itself in outward conduct, is the redeeming power which lifts mankind to higher levels and which alone can raise him to the full stature of his divine heritage. It is of no consequence to discover God objectively unless the soul makes the discovering subjective, absorbing it and responding to its promptings.

## VIII

## THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

YET how are we to reconcile the idea of God as the Father of men, of God as love, of God as omnipotent, with the hard facts of human life, the evil and the pain, the inequalities of conditions, the suffering that so often afflicts the righteous while the wicked just as often rejoice in their prosperity? It is a problem that has sought answer from the beginnings of time and found none that fully satisfied. Job and his "comforters" wrestled with it and their contentions are voiced in one of the greatest dramatic poems in all literature, but they left it unsolved. All the conceptions of opposing deities of good and evil have arisen from it, and the greater proportion of mankind still believes in a conflict of gods as the only explanation of the paradoxes of life.

Yet the fact that it constantly presses for solution makes its discussion perennial, and while one must approach the question with diffidence it

may be possible to throw some light upon it. The primary difficulty, of course, lies in man's limited perspective. He sees sorrow and suffering; he sees poverty and riches side by side; he sees hard and patient labour unrewarded in one while fortune smiles upon the indolence of another. These phenomena of life are directly before his face; he cannot draw far enough away to view them in their actual proportions in relation to infinite time and purpose.

"It may reasonably be that much that seems to us quite inexplicable would fall easily into its fit place, if only we could stand at the centre with God and see His full purpose working itself out in all creation."[1] And the writer of the foregoing recalls the saying of an old teacher that "an insect crawling up a column of the Parthenon, painfully making its way around some pore in the stone, was as well fitted to judge of the architecture of the Parthenon as we of the infinitude of God's plans." Indeed, it is by calling the attention of Job to his insignificance that God peremptorily ends the argument in that book. If we assume that creation is God working out His purposes, we have got to assume also that life in general is in accord with His design and that

[1] King, *Fundamental Questions.*

it is constantly contributing to the fulfilment of that design.

We can, perhaps, make an approach to an understanding of the problem if we can first find out what life is for. We have said that the reason for life "is the concern of God in the creation of intelligent spirits in likeness to Himself through the shaping processes of a material experience. Life, that is to say, is a means of soul-making." Now, it is a fact beyond dispute that it is the experiences of life that make character, that give form and body, so to speak, to personality. No matter how rich the individual inheritance may be in the materials of personality, no personality is born complete. It must be shaped and rounded and tempered and tested by living.

Man is endowed at his birth with a divine consciousness, which, however, must be developed by and through his environment, by its exercise in relation to environment. Each one is as aware of his spiritual growth, of his real self, his ego, as he is of his physical growth. He knows at twenty that while he is fundamentally the same self as at six, he has grown and expanded within as certainly as his body has increased in size and weight. And he knows also, if he gives any

thought to it at all, that this inner growth comes from the shaping processes of experience, that whatever he may be he has been made what he is by the circumstances and contacts of life and his reactions to them. The self, in short, is a product of experience, and if self and soul are in reality synonymous terms, then the soul is a product of experience. "What makes each one of us be what we are is only the soul," said Plato long ago. We may therefore say that souls are actually made by life, by the experiences of living. Then, since that is what life regularly accomplishes, it must be for that that life exists.

But how does life make selfs or souls? What do we mean by the shaping processes of experience? The answer is to be found in the shaping processes that are visible to us on every side. Is there anything in the universe, or in the creations of man, that is not shaped by fire, by pressure, by bending, by blows, or by some such operation of forming forces? The furnace, the forge, the lathe, the hammer, are all essential instruments in the material creations of man. If inorganic matter could feel, it is certain that everything that is made would come into existence through a process of pain.

Similarly, human character, personality, is

shaped by the stresses of life, the pressure of its labours, the buffets of circumstances, the struggles that beset existence, the fires and the blows that in greater or less degree are the common experience of mankind, all of which require the exercise of the soul that is essential to its development, and all of which involve more or less pain of body or spirit, more or less trouble or sorrow. Was there ever a man worthy of the name who had not striven with obstacles, who had not been buffeted by environment, who had not in some degree suffered "the stings and arrows of outrageous fortune?" And would he have been much of a man without these formative forces; could he have become a man in the likeness of his creator without them?

Consider one who from infancy had never known what it was to want for anything, to strive for anything, for whom life had no impediments, who had never known the slightest trouble or felt the smallest pain, who had never found occasion for self-denial or the least sacrifice, to whom sorrow was unknown. Such a life is hardly imaginable because no one has ever had such an existence, nor could have. But assuming such a being, would he be a man, in any other than the physical sense? He would be without

any of the qualities that distinguish character, for there would have been nothing in his life to develop them. If all men were such as he, living under conditions that made such life possible, if such conditions were conceivable, mankind from its beginning would have been stagnant, there could have been no progress, no development of intelligence, no accumulation of knowledge, no conquest of nature's forces, no civilization.

Man has moved forward only as he has felt desire for something better, only as need or want has given impetus to effort, only as he has struggled with and overcome obstacles, only as he has suffered in the strife for advancement, only as he has made sacrifices for betterment. The whole record of mankind is one of struggle for survival and for progress, and it is clear that neither survival nor progress could have been accomplished without that struggle with its accompaniment of blows, of pain and of sorrow.

It must be, therefore, that these things are essential to the evolution of man, essential to both his material and his spiritual advancement, essential to the exercise of consciousness and the creation of personality with character, essential to the shaping of souls, essential to the vast purposes of creation. Human life is what it is

because all its elements, good and bad, are necessary to the process of its development, because they are all factors in the plan of the Infinite Wisdom.

Let us consider these factors, or those we think bad and of which we complain, in some detail. Why, for example, is pain? Why are we afflicted with it? Why do we have to suffer at all? Because, first of all, pain is a physiological necessity. It is essential to self-preservation. It is one of nature's guardians of life. Without it we would soon perish. If we did not feel a burn or a cut or a blow, if we did not feel the internal pangs of over-indulgence or of disease, we could never learn to avoid the things that injure or destroy. Again, if we could not feel pain we could not feel pleasure, for it is only by contrast with pain that pleasure is appreciated. 'The heart," says the poet, "can ne'er a transport know that never feels a pain."

More importantly, from the spiritual standpoint, pain is an agency of moral discipline. There could be no such virtues as courage or fortitude, sympathy, pity, or charity, if it were not for pain; for courage only arises in the face of danger involving pain of the body or the mind, fortitude is shown only in the endurance

of such pains; sympathy and pity spring from the sight of suffering, and nearly all charity is created by it. And pain contributes to the greatest personalities and the greatest achievements of man. "The discipline of suffering," says Nietzsche, "know ye not that it is only this discipline that has produced all the elevations of humanity hitherto? The tension of soul in misfortune which communicates to it its energy, its shuddering in view of rack and ruin, its inventiveness and bravery in steadfastly enduring, interpreting and exploiting misfortune, and whatever depth mystery, disguise, spirit, artifice or greatness has been bestowed upon the soul, has it not been bestowed through suffering, through the discipline of great suffering?"

And, says Paley: "Out of suffering have emerged the strongest souls. The most massive characters are seamed with scars. Martyrs have put on their coronation robes glittering with fire; and through their tears have the sorrowful first seen the gates of heaven." Moreover, what would the life of Jesus have been to humanity but for the cross, and surely it is the cross in every life that draws toward the crown. How empty would life be without pain, the base of every tragedy, the theme of every great drama, of the finest

poetry, of the most thrilling narratives of fact or fiction? Human life without pain would be physiologically impossible and spiritually futile.

Similarly, evil is an essential of life because it is only through the existence of evil that the sense of good is developed. For the same reason that if we could not feel pain we could not recognize pleasure, we could not know good if there were no evil. The difference between right and wrong could not come into our consciousness if there were no wrong, and it is the recognition of this difference and the necessity of choice between them that is the greatest factor in the spiritual development of man. If he is to grow spiritually, he must know good and evil, and character comes from the inward and outward struggle to overcome evil and enthrone the good. In the measure in which men choose the good and apply it in their lives they make the approach to moral perfection, but such a choice would be impossible if there were no alternatives from which to choose. It is therefore only through evil that man can learn good.

If there were no evil, there could be no conscience to stir man's heart to righteous conduct; there could be no moral judgment to exercise man's spiritual intelligence; there would be no

struggle to develop his moral fibre. It is not too much to say that the greatest influence for good in human life is evil. For it is evil that calls into play all of man's highest qualities, that engages him in an endless conflict whereby his spirit manifests its divinity.

If we are to regard God as omnipotent and omniscient, if we are to regard Him as constantly concerned in the processes of creation, we must assume that life is what it is because He wills it to be so, or because He permits it to be so, and, in either case, because life as it is is working out His purposes. Evil having always existed, it must be that it is necessary to human development or it would not, and never would, have existed. If God is omnipotent, we must assume that He could put an end to evil at any time if He so willed. If God is omniscient, then we must assume that He, in His infinite wisdom, regards it as an agency that He will not or cannot dispense with in the processes He has established.

We are at loss to account for the unlimited powers which we ascribe to God unless there are reasons for the existence of evil which He regards as sufficient, else it would not be. And if there could be no consciousness of good if there

were no evil, if there could be no exercise of the spirit, and therefore no development of the spirit, if there were no evil with which to struggle, that would seem to be ample reason for its being.

However, that presumption necessarily involves a recognition of individual freedom of will and responsibility. For if men are not free to act, free to choose, then these reasons can have no validity. If men are but automatons moved solely by circumstances or by deity, the idea of life as a process of spiritual development is an illusion. They cannot be really responsible for their conduct, and the existence of evil is unexplainable save as a means whereby a cruel and merciless God makes sport with His creatures. It is only as we regard men as free beings, masters, in a limited way, of their own fates, captains of their own souls, as Henley expresses it, and therefore individually responsible for the conduct of their lives, that we can perceive reasons for evil that justify its existence, and can perceive that its existence is in general consistent with the conception of a just and loving God, however difficult it may be to discern that consistency in many individual cases.

There are, it is true, persuasive arguments for

the theory that free will does not exist, that all our acts and all our thoughts are determined by forces over which we have no control. But however cogent it may be as a theory, it is a fact that no one puts it into practice and that every one acts constantly on the presumption that he has the right and the power to choose his course and to regulate his conduct. The determinist, after writing an essay proving conclusively, as he thinks, that there is no such thing as freedom of choice, sits down at a hotel table, examines the menu with care and chooses what he wants for his dinner. Or, choosing to go for a ride, he enters his car, chooses the direction he shall take, north, east, south or west, and at every fork of the highway decides which road he wishes to traverse, just as though he really has the privilege of choice. Regardless of theories of determinism, all men act upon the principle of free will.

"The sense of freedom is there; those who deny freedom nevertheless feel free. If men were not free, we should expect the feeling and the fact in most instances to correspond. It is most unlikely that in the majority of instances, when introspection is at the best, the fact and feeling should be at variance. In most instances

if we feel sick we are sick; if we feel well we are well; if we feel cold we are cold, and so on; so if we feel free we are free. No purpose could be served in the economy of nature by general delusion. Nature is not a magician hypnotizing us into the belief in our freedom when we are really fated; we are not all crazy nor all deluded; we take our freedom in the same good faith in which we take the other sure deliverances of our consciousness corrected by social control. What is a fact for the rational social individual consciousness is a fact; and if, as we suppose, consciousness be the ultimate reality nothing else is a fact. Consciousness is the final bar of judgment." [2]

Furthermore, the individual sense of freedom is expressed collectively in the public demand for political freedom. The American nation is founded upon the principle of human liberty, and the rise of modern democracy owes its origin to, and acquires its impetus from, that principle. The purpose of democracy is the attainment of the largest individual freedom consistent with social rights, and the operative basis of democracy is the free expression of the choice of the people in the character of their government and

[2] Horne, *Free Will and Human Responsibility.*

the selection of its officials. Yet, of course, if there is no such thing as freedom this also is vanity, a vast delusion, and all such terms as choice, selection, will, volition, decision, judgment, are without meaning.

If freedom is not a fact, nothing in consciousness can be a fact. It is only on the assumption that it is a fact that human life becomes in a measure comprehensible, and its relation to divinity perceivable. But in the fact of freedom man is endowed with the privilege of making his own way under certain limitations, turning in one direction or another as he wills, responsible in a degree for his choice and subject to its consequences, be they good or ill. In thus giving liberty to human beings God necessarily imposes a limitation upon Himself, upon His own power. He must refrain from complete support or compelling interference or there would be no freedom.

When a child is learning to walk, it is essential for the parent to let him stand alone and move alone if he is to acquire the proper use of his legs. He could not learn to walk with confidence and sureness if the parent continuously held him up and would not turn him loose. Similarly he could not learn to think and act intelligently if every thought and every move-

ment were absolutely dominated by the parent. In learning to walk, the child may fall and be hurt, and in entering into life he must encounter many obstacles, face many dangers, suffer injuries, distress of body and mind, and run the risk of losing life or soul, but the parent knows that only through self-experience the child can attain self-control and self-direction and become a man; and so he lets him free to go his own way, but hovering over him in thought, guiding him by counsel, admonition and example, in so far as he can consistent with that freedom, tenderly solicitous, eager that he do right and do well, and suffering as he suffers.

So God, the Father, gives the divine privilege of liberty to His children as an essential of their self-development, imposing restraint upon His own powers in order that they may learn through experience, and through experience form their own personalities, shape their own souls. "The same power which brought the universe into existence is regulating it and controlling it subject to self-limitation which brought conscious beings into existence and endowed them with free will and with power of a very limited kind. . . . The production of a race of free creatures who would go right of their own volition, not because they

were compelled but because they willed, not by necessity but by free choice—the evolution of such a race as that was of sufficient value to justify running the risks." [3]

In creating man God endowed him, in addition to intelligence, with certain instincts, or call them what we may, certain innate tendencies, which are found in greater or less degree in every human creature. These instincts are all for his good, but being free he may use them rightly to his advantage or wrongly to his injury. Self-preservation, the basic instinct, is essential to the maintenance of human existence, and is therefore inherently friendly to life. But if wrongly applied it may give rise to harmful propensities. Savagery and crime, oppression or slavery, may result from the exaggerated ideas of an individual, a class or a nation as to what is necessary to self-preservation.

The instinct of sex is a necessity of reproduction, and normally it is the source of the noblest and most beautiful sentiments and actions of human life; but if abused, it becomes an instrument of degeneration, of prolific vice, of disease and destruction. The instinct of possession or acquisition, the instinct of creation and accom-

[3] Lodge, *Evolution and Creation.*

plishment, underlie all of the material and much of the spiritual advancement of civilization, but abused these instincts become avarice and greed, injustice and cruelty. So every human instinct, designed for good, may be productive of evil if wrongly used, just as the knife in the hands of the surgeon may be an instrument of healing but in the hands of the murderer an instrument of death.

God places these instincts within us, and the intelligence to use them, and it is from their misuse that evil arises in the world. It is because freedom is essential to our development that we are privileged to use them wrongly as well as rightly, and evil therefore is the price of our freedom. It is not God who creates evil in the relations of man. It is man who creates the evils from which mankind suffers, and because God must give man the liberty by which he acquires growth through experience, He must permit the consequences of that liberty, though He must suffer in the observance of its wrong use even as the human father suffers when he sees his children reaping the fruits of their own folly.

Even so there is compensation. It is by trial that the child learns to walk and it is by his

errors that he learns. Trial and error are the teachers of mankind and through evil we slowly and painfully learn the way to good. Moreover, God does not leave us wholly to our own devices, or without help and guidance. He has planted within us the divine spark from His own flame, which is love, and love is a constant and strong influence toward good. This, the chief of all the instincts He has given us, the one in which He fixes Himself within our hearts, the supreme constructive force of the universe, works always against evil. Even in its errors, and human love is not without them, its face is ever toward the light, toward its supernal source.

"Creation as demanded by the nature of God implies a real independence, a real agency and responsibility on the part of the beings created. . . . Freedom, and to that extent contingence, is therefore a condition of there being a finite world in any real sense at all. The spirit of God moving in the hearts of men is the guiding and formative agency in the process, operating not as a natural force that overbears opposition but as an inward illumination drawing them with the infinite patience of love." [4]

Pouring through all human hearts in greater

[4] Pringle-Patterson, *The Spirit.*

or less measure, as the way for it is cleared, love brings compensation for most human ills, sets its face against all evil, turns selfishness into self-sacrifice, cruelty into mercy, harshness into tenderness, injustice into justice, sordidness into spirituality. Largely through its gentle but pervasive and persistent influences man has grown out of savagery into civilization. Despotism has been virtually banished from the earth, slavery has almost ceased to exist, the masses are no longer universally held under the iron heel of class domination. Women are not treated as inferior and subject beings, and cruelty to children is not countenanced among enlightened people. Cruel and inhuman punishments are abolished. Hospitals exist everywhere for the scientific care of the sick, pain is alleviated and the horrors of the surgery once endured has been banished. Education gives to the lowly the means to rise, and benevolence that in past times was a relatively rare blossom of the heart, blooms freely and with bountiful fruitage wherever people have been raised to the highest elevation of ethical thought and conduct. Humanity has become a term synonymous with consideration for others and failure to exercise it is regarded as a shame to individual or nation.

All these, and many more, are directly the products of love moving in the hearts of men, the results of that divine influence which emanates from the source of all good, and which is working constantly not only for the general betterment of mankind, but to mitigate evil and lessen pain everywhere. It is only necessary to look back over the pages of history to see that man's struggle with evil is marked with a constant succession of triumphs, and that while evil may never cease to exist and pain can never disappear, the course of mankind has been steadily forward and upward.

Still more importantly, if God, as we have learned, is manifest in all creation, eternally busy in the task, we may be sure that He is ever at hand, and not an unfeeling, unfriendly force, but a Father, tender, solicitous, loving, giving aid, encouragement, guidance and strength whenever it is asked and needed, and when it is not asked, when the conditions permit the illuminative working of His spirit. That there is somehow and in some way a guidance in the affairs of men that is not an interference with their freedom or with nature's laws, but which seems to shape circumstances to promote definite ends, has always been felt and believed by the wisest of men. Shake-

speare expressed the conviction when he said, "There's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will."

It seems a reasonable presumption that if there is a Supreme Intelligence directing the processes of material creation progressively, that Intelligence cannot be wholly aloof from the more important process of man's spiritual evolution, but must exercise some influence, within its self-imposed limitations, upon man's development. There is a power, that is to say, that leads mankind forward, not by compulsion but by influencing the circumstances of self-direction. The intuitive sense of that presence, and faith in its guidance, has ever been the support and the salvation of humanity. It is certainly well with any one, with any individual or any nation, when it can say with the Psalmist, "God is our refuge and strength."

Human life, in short, is a process of creation, of soul creation, through the refining influence of fire, through the shaping stresses of experience, through the strengthening activities of struggle, through the tempering agencies of pain and sorrow, under the watchful care and guidance of a Father who we may believe is constantly saying: "I have loved thee with an everlasting

love, therefore with lovingkindness have I drawn thee."

The making of souls demands the negative as well as the positive forces of formation, the evil as well as the good, the sorrow as well as the joy. We live in order to create our souls, and no matter what the circumstances of heredity or environment, no matter what the conditions in which we are placed or the obstacles in our way, each act and each thought of our life, each response to the material or the spiritual influences which surround us, contributes to the process of soul creation.

"We are not here for the sake of possession, nor for the sake of power, nor for the sake of happiness; we are here that we may elucidate the divine elements in the human spirit."[5] In such a conception of the purposes and the processes of human life it is possible to regard even evil and pain as disciplinary and formative agencies that in their ends are beneficent in the measure that we overcome the one and rise superior to the other.

[5] Walter Rathenau, *Was Wird Werden.*

## IX

## THE GOAL BEYOND

WHILE it is possible to perceive clearly the benevolence of the process of human evolution when viewed in the whole, and even when viewed in its application to individual life in the majority of cases, there are yet visible to every one instances of overwhelming and undeserved misfortune, of unrelieved injustice, of suffering too profound for any compensation in this life, instances that seem to contradict the idea of an infinite and unfailing benevolence, that make it difficult to reconcile them with the conception of a God of love. If God is love, how can these things be, and if death is the end, there is no answer that gives satisfaction to the mind or to the heart.

It is only in the conviction that death is not the end, that death is but the door to another life wherein these things are compensated, that these discordant paradoxes of life can be merged into the general harmony of the process. It is only in this conviction that they can be made

consistent with the idea of a Father whose love embraces all men, whose love is the dominating and directing force in all creation, "the love," as Dante expresses it, "that moves the sun in heaven and all the stars."

Is there ground in fact and in reason for this conviction? There is, first of all, the intuitive sense of immortality that has been universal among men from the dawn days of human intelligence. Nothing in the progress of modern science has been more remarkable than the researches and discoveries that have proved the great antiquity of man. It is but a short time ago that it was commonly assumed that man had existed only a few thousand years. Now, it is known that he has been an inhabitant of earth tens of thousands or even hundreds of thousands of years. And among the remains which have proved the existence of human life in times exceedingly remote have been found constant evidences of belief in a life after death.

"It is a startling thought," says an eminent scientist, "that mayhap to the dying Mousterian race came the first glimmerings of immortality. . . . Wherever he is, man cannot get away from his thoughts, and the probability

seems to be that at whatever stage he first began to reflect—at whatever stage he began first, intermittently doubtless, to wonder at the things he did not understand, and that stage was certainly long pre-Mousterian—he had begun to move toward the conception of a Power or Powers in the world other than himself which stood in some sort of determining relation to him, and of himself as possessed by an invisible form of being which might persist apart from his body. In short, archæology does not gainsay the suggestion that from the beginning of rational, *i. e.*, of human life, God set eternity and some knowledge of Him in the heart of man."[1]

The universal sense of deity, heretofore discussed, seems always to have been associated with a sense of immortality, an intuitive conviction of life after death. "Among savage races," says Sir James Frazer, "a life after death is not a matter of speculation and conjecture, of hope and fear, it is a practical certainty which the individual as little dreams of doubting as he doubts the reality of his conscious existence. He assumes it without inquiry and acts upon it without hesitation, as if it were one of the best

[1] Simpson, *Man and the Attainment of Immortality.*

ascertained truths within the limits of human experience." [2]

The evidences of this conviction are to be found in the remains of the extinct races of man, and among existing primitive races the world over. Nor is it lost in the development of civilization. In the cultivated society of Chaldea, of Egypt, of India, in the later cultures of Greece and Rome, in the far-off civilization of Mexico, everywhere indeed, it was present. "'Tis true, 'tis certain," says Homer, "man, though dead, retains part of himself, the immortal mind remains." And modern civilization finds it persistently dominant in the thought of mankind.

This universality and this persistence, in and through all forms and shades of all cultures, in all races and all times, is an impressive indication of something in the human consciousness that continuously suggests an existence of the soul beyond the grave. Just as surely as there is something within man that unfailingly produces a conception of deity, however crude it may be, there is also something that adds to this basic concept of religion the idea of a life after death. These two conceptions have always been invariably associated in the intuitions as if they

[2] Frazer, *Belief in Immortality.*

were essentially related and complementary. And if the sense of deity in man has its source in the deity itself, as it was the endeavour of a previous chapter to show, then it seems a reasonable presumption that this companion sense is derived from the same source.

*"'Tis the divinity that stirs within us;*
*'Tis Heaven itself that points out an hereafter*
*And intimates eternity to man."*

The idea of God, it appears, requires for its completeness the idea of immortality. And these linked ideas are in accord with the harmony of the universe. The theory of evolution presents a progressive creation, a creation that moves from goal to goal. Inorganic creation moved toward organic creation, toward life; life moved toward the creation of conscious beings; with the coming of consciousness spirit entered into life and spiritual evolution began with an inherent tendency toward God, an inherent disposition to seek Him. And that search has been continuous, unceasing, never faltering, a process as unfailing as the "law of continuity" in the material processes of creation.

As man has progressed spiritually his conception of God has broadened, deepened, has been

refined and purified. He saw Him first, as it were, through the clouds that enveloped his soul, a shape distorted by the moving vapours that permitted but a dim vision. As the spirit grew and the vision became clearer, he began to see Him in truer outline, and to recognize in Him qualities that inspired less of fear and more of trust and affection, to perceive in Him the lineaments of a friend rather than the countenance of an enemy, to find in Him that support and guidance which would enable a psalmist to cry, "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil, for thou art with me."

Still closer, as spiritual discernment increased, he discovered in Him a Father, a being in whom love is dominant, and began to realize, but wonderingly, doubtfully and with great hesitation, that he was the child of this Father. The process, in short, has been one of constant approach nearer and nearer toward God, and with that approach a better conception of Him and a better understanding of his relation to Him.

This process of spiritual evolution, this progress of religious revelation through spiritual illumination, is not conjecture, it is history. And as the process of material creation is said by

scientists to have advanced from a simple cell to the complex organism of man, so it would seem that his spiritual progress has grown out of that intuitive sense of deity with which he appears to have been endowed from the beginning of consciousness, with its inherent urge to search, with its inherent urge toward truth and beauty and goodness which are as the garments of God.

If this is true, then, to what end this spiritual progress? If it is true, what of that intuitive sense of immortality which seems ever to have been associated with the sense of deity? If creation moves from goal to goal, what is the goal of spiritual evolution? Is the goal not indicated in the historical process above outlined which reveals spiritual progress as a going toward God? Modern biologists have discovered that the germ-plasm holds in embryo not merely the physical characteristics of the individual but its inherited "traits;" that what one is to be is to a certain extent fixed within the germ cell.

There is implanted within the seed, at the very beginning of individual existence, qualities and trends that govern in part, and influence in part, the form and character of its maturity. Likewise all organic life is traced back through simpler forms to a single protoplasmic cell which

contained within itself all the possibilities of that varied and complex life which in the course of ages grew out of it. Is it not probable, then, that spiritual evolution follows a similar course, developing with sure trend from a spiritual germ cell implanted within man at the beginning of his history as a conscious being, and replanted within each individual forever afterwards; which contained, and ever contains, the spark of divinity, the " chromasomes " of the spirit, the sources of the intuitive sense of deity, of the vague intimations of immortality, and of those aspirations and urges toward perfection, which have ever characterized the moral and religious life of mankind and actuated and directed its spiritual progress?

The general harmony of creation, the accord and fixity of its laws, would seem to imply that the processes which apply to organic life have their analogies in the spiritual life. And surely if the spirit is the crowning product of creation, the chief work of the creator, it cannot be a mere fortuitous consummation; it must have been developed from spiritual germs through the operation of similar laws of growth. And as the whole mystery of physical life is enclosed in the microscopic germ-plasm, so it may be that

the whole mystery of the spiritual life, the mystery of God, of man's relation to God, and of the immortality of his soul, is enclosed within the intuitive sense with which all men in all ages seem to have been endowed.

If, then, the trend of spiritual progress, as it is revealed in human history, is expressible in the phrase, "going toward God," and if this trend has its source and motive force in the innate sense of deity that makes mankind "incorrigibly religious," what is the implication of this sense of immortality that is inextricably associated with it? Surely there must be some meaning in that association, and just as surely that meaning must relate to the ends clearly observable in the trend noted, the ultimate finding of God. If that to which this second sense points is an illusion, then it is in itself a delusion. But if that is the case, then the first, which is certainly not a delusion, is a vast deception, utterly inconsistent with the conception of a deity that enthrones love in the human heart and writes it over the face of the universe.

But if that to which it points is a reality, then it refers to an ultimate that gives a rational and benevolent purpose to the entire proc-

ess of spiritual life and spiritual progress, that places a crown upon it and glorifies it. And this view, and this alone, is in accord with the spiritual needs and aspirations of man. Moreover, it is in harmony, let us repeat, with the physical processes of organic creation. "Behind variations of an evolutionary sort is a psychological urge or desire which, within the limitations set by environment and inheritance, though ever and anon breaking through these limitations with a mutation, drives organisms on to higher and ever higher goals." [3]

"When we consider the whole course of evolution from amœba to man, from the simplest motor responses to the development of intelligence and reason capable of studying the universe and its origin, we are impressed with the thought that evolution must have been guided by something other than choice." [4] "All advance ultimately means that the organism has entered into some new relation with the environment. . . . Now the most distinctive feature about the evolutionary process as a whole is just the fact of the successive emergence of new kinds of relationship at ever higher levels in that process. . . .

[3] Mayer, *The Seven Seals of Science.*
[4] Conklin, *The Direction of Human Evolution.*

Is it not probable, therefore, that with man there emerges the possibility of some new relationship —a moral linkage with that which is ultimate in the environment, and which involves wholeness and persistence of spiritual being—in short that individuality which is immortality? "[5]

Organic evolution, that is to say, moves in general from lower to higher forms in response to an inherent urge, guided not by chance but by intelligence, and with each advance moves into a new and broader relation with its environment. And with man, who alone among created beings is endowed with the spirit, it must involve a movement " on to higher and ever higher goals," to an increasingly closer relationship with that ultimate environment which is God.

" Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs," says Tennyson with poetic insight. Can it be possible that this process, this increasing purpose, this approach toward God, must terminate in individual extinction? To think so is to regard the process as one that eternally defeats its own end. It is to conclude that a progress that is obviously directed by an infinite intelligence, a progress that advances triumphantly to ever higher goals in conformity

[5] Simpson, *Man and the Attainment of Immortality.*

with definite and unfailing laws, terminates invariably and inevitably in a *cul de sac*.

It may be assumed, to be sure, that this intelligence is concerned only with general results, with the evolution of the species as a whole, and is indifferent as to the individual. But this would make it a mere mechanician, content to scrap its products after they serve a momentary mechanical purpose, casting them aside with no more feeling than one who consigns a worn out utensil to the junk heap. If it were true, it would leave inexplicable the development of the human consciousness, the evolution of the human spirit, the existence of the qualities, the sentiments and the aspirations of human nature, the spiritual attributes of mankind.

And these attributes, as we have seen, are the culminating products of the long process of creation. Millions of years were spent in preparation for them, millions of years of infinitely patient labour, and with the final birth of human consciousness the seeds of these attributes were planted within it, the germs of divinity from which have come the highest qualities of humanity, from which have come every expression of hope and faith and love, from which have come every sentiment of religion, every conception of

God and every thought and conviction of life after death. Now if all this time, all this labour, has been expended to obtain these results, man, as we have said before, must have an inestimable value in the regard of the creator, and it must be the spirit of man to which that regard attaches, for it is only the spirit that distinguishes man from the lower orders of life, it is only within man that He has breathed "a living soul."

Unless our conception of God is entirely wrong, He attaches that value to each individual soul. Apparently the whole process of human life is to develop individuality, to shape souls through the fires and the blows of experience. And it would seem that the incentive and purpose of this process is the desire of God to bring into existence conscious spirits in likeness to Himself, beings capable of feeling, expressing and responding to that love which is "creation's final law," and which is the essence of God's own being.

Now, the essential quality of pure love is the welfare of its object, and the objects of God's love must be the individual souls which have been brought into existence by the operation of His laws. It is inconceivable that He makes

them, or gives them life and the means and incentives for self-making, under His guidance, merely to destroy them. Such a thought is utterly inconsistent with any idea of love.

"The highest conception we can form of perfect personality is love, not in any shallow sentimental sense, but the self-giving love which expends itself for others, and lives in all their joys and sorrows. Such love, then, the principle of our argument bids us take as the ultimate value of which the universe is the manifestation. It bids us conceive the inmost being of God not solely as the realization of eternal truth and the enjoyment of perfect beauty, but pre-eminently as the exercise and fruition of His nature as love. And if so, the value of the finite world to the Spirit of the Universe must lie, above all else . . . in the spirits to whom He has given the capacity to make themselves in His own image. The spirits themselves must be the values to God, not simply the degrees of intelligence and virtue, abstractly considered, which they respectively realize. They are not made, then, . . . to be broken up and cast aside and to be replaced by relays of others in a continual succession." [6]

Surely not. It is impossible to reconcile such

[6] Pringle-Patterson, *The Idea of Immortality*.

a disposition of men's souls with that conception of God which is the highest achievement of man's intelligence and spirit. To live is to love and to be loved, to be loved, above all, by God, and immortality, or at the very least the chance of immortality, conditioned only by the volition of the individual, is demanded by the very nature of God. "For I am persuaded," says Paul, "that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord."

Immortality is no less demanded by the nature of man. As the rose slowly opens up its bud to drink in the full glory of the sun which suffuses its petals with the colours of maturity, so the spirit of man has slowly through the ages opened up its face to God and has drawn from Him the influences of development. When man first began dimly to distinguish right from wrong, he began to set up standards of morality, perceiving that the choice of good or evil rested within him and that good in general was desirable while evil was not. When the spirit first stirred within man, he began to notice that some things were better

than others, that some conditions were better than others, and gradually to realize that some measure of betterment lay within his own hands. That involved a distinction between what is and what ought to be.

Whether this referred to material or to spiritual things it was a spiritual unfolding, it was the birth of the ideal. Man's ideals have ever been the impetus to his advance materially, morally and spiritually. In conceiving of something better, something more useful, something finer, something more beautiful, he has embodied a purpose and set a goal toward which he strives, and having reached it conceives again and sets another goal. The progress of life, therefore, is characterized by effort, by struggle, for something better that lies beyond. And this progress is necessarily accompanied by faith, for without belief in the reality of that better thing that lies beyond, and in the belief that it is possibly attainable, there could be no effort to attain. The ideal, then, supported by faith, is and has ever been the motive force of man's advance.

Man thus is under a constant urge, a constant incentive to press forward, from goal to goal. In the physical realm nothing exemplifies this so conspicuously as science. Each discovery but

serves to create demands for new efforts for further discoveries. The quest of science is truth, yet the more it reveals truth the more it realizes that the larger truth is still beyond, and ever beyond, ever attainable in part but never encompassed; and if he lifts his eyes above the immediate goal which he seeks, and permits his spirit to peer into the vistas of the far future he must perceive that there is no end to the quest of science save in the ultimate of all truth, which is God, the creator of that with which all science deals, and the end toward which all science moves. And science in its eternal quest is ever moved by ideals and supported by faith.

Similarly in the spiritual realm man is ever actuated by his ideals and stimulated by his faith. His course from the beginning has been a striving upward, with a conception of truth ever before him as an immediate goal.

*"God's gift was that man should conceive of truth*
*And yearn to gain it, catching at mistake*
*As midway help till he reached fact indeed."*

Even his mistakes have been, when recognized, as rounds of a ladder helping him to climb. Perceiving that life's highest values lie in the realm of the spirit he seeks ever to attain them,

but ever falling short of full attainment, securing the good but finding that the better is still beyond. Yet in faith he progresses.

"In keeping with the great principle of continuity everywhere displayed in the working out of the world's evolution, we have found this faith foreshadowed in the upward striving that is the essence of life. . . . Here, as everywhere—in its highest as in the lowest form—faith is striving and striving is faith. The whole conscious being is concerned; there is not merely the cognition of what is, there is also an appreciation of what it is worth, a sense of the promise and potency of further good that it may enfold; there is a yearning to realize this; and there is finally the active endeavour that such feeling prompts.

"It is through this faith that man is where he is to-day, through it that mountains have been removed and the unattainable verily attained. More life and fuller, achieved by much toil and struggle, an ascent to higher levels, not movement along the line of least resistance—this is the one increasing purpose that we can so far discern. . . . And how do we stand now? That the present world and progress on the plane of the present world do not and never will meet our

highest needs—about that there is little question. But where in what is, in what we have so far attained, can we discern those eternal values that point upwards beyond this present world?

"Surely in all that we find of the beautiful and sublime of this earth on which we dwell and the starry heavens above it; in all that led men long ago to regard nature as a cosmos; in all that is best and noblest in the annals of human life; in these very needs themselves that the seen and the temporal fail to meet; and, above all, in that nascent sense of the divine presence which constitutes the truly religious life, and converts faith into the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." [7]

The sense of deity, the intuitive intimations of immortality, the nature of God, the nature of man, the paradoxes of life, the unattained and here unattainable ultimate of human ideals, the principle of continuity that is manifested in all existence, the reasonableness and intelligibility of conscious life, the imperishable faith in the better that lies beyond, and the unshakable confidence in a God who is, and who is love, all and every one demand a life after death as the only

[7] Ward, *The Realm of Ends.*

solution of life's profoundest problems. "I believe in the immortality of the soul," says John Fiske, "as a supreme act of faith in the reasonableness of God's work," and "our dissatisfaction with any other solution is the blazing evidence of immortality," says Emerson. Indeed, there is no other solution that is consistent with the reasonableness of God's work as it is manifested in the field of our observation and experience in this life.

As the attributes of God are manifested in the personality of Jesus Christ, "He who was the thought, the heart, the self of God, made audible and visible to men,"[8] so is He the living symbol of the larger life, the life beyond in which the spirit of man may confidently expect to "carry on" toward the consummation of his destiny, in which the approach to God will some time realize His infinite purposes, and in which beauty and goodness and truth and love will find their ultimate perfection.

If, therefore, in our quest of God, we have come to this conviction, we may look forward with unfaltering faith to the goal beyond, confident that it holds within its mysteries the fulfilment of the divine processes of life, under the

[8] Simpson, *Man and the Attainment of Immortality.*

continuing care and direction of Infinite Love; doubting not that these processes, as we can observe them here, are assurance of a life beyond, of a better, more abundant life.

*"All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good shall exist,*
*Not its semblance but itself; no beauty, nor good nor power*
*Whose voice has gone forth, but each survives for the melodist,*
*When eternity confirms the conception of an hour.*
*The high that proved too high, the heroic for earth too hard,*
*Are music sent up to God by the lover and the bard.*
*Enough that He heard it once; we shall hear it by and by."*

*Printed in the United States of America*

## BELIEF THAT INSPIRES

*ROGER W. BABSON*

### A Business Man's Creed

Written for His Clients and The Younger Generation. Illustrated, 75c

A little book for thinking people, particularly young people. Mr. Babson has written for them a brief, simple but very thoughtful study of life as it is, and of what and who lie beneath it and above it. Faith in God shines through it all. Anyone disturbed over apparent contradiction between science and religion, will find this little book distinctly inspiring.

*CHARLES C. ALBERTSON, D.D.*

### The Reality of Religion $1.25

A book for daily reading. Dr. Albertson's keen analytical power and serene Christian faith are reflected in these discussions of such themes as man's search for reality, the contribution of Christianity to daily life, and faith as an aid to victory. Each discussion is followed by a series of reflections for each day of a week, with scripture reading and a prayer.

*BERNARD C. CLAUSEN, D.D.*

### Pen-Pictures on Calvary $1.50

A quickening and a deepening of the spirit of devotion in the Christian reader will follow the reading of this book. The solemnity of those significant hours, the supreme love of Jesus for His disciples and those who should believe in Him through their word, and the utter abandonment of the Saviour to His mission of sacrifice, are here brought powerfully and reverently to mind and heart.

## A PRACTICAL HANDBOOK

*ROBERT E. SPEER, D.D.*

### How to Speak Effectively Without Notes Boards, 50c

A very brief, practical and workable system for extempore speaking, written by a master of the art. The average man or woman who makes the most of this booklet cannot fail to add greatly to his power as a public speaker.

*ROBERT N. McLEAN, D.D.*

## That Mexican!

A Study of America's Next-Door Neighbor. Illustrated, **$2.00**

"The complete story of present-day characters and situations under the flag of our southern neighbor in an intensely interesting new book. The mortal ills of Juan Garcia, are set forth in detail. His love of beauty, his genius for art and for music, his courage in the face of long odds—the better side of Juan's character are adequately presented."—*Spokane Chronicle.*

*ALEX. RATTRAY HAY*

## The Indians of South America and the Gospel

Illustrated, **$1.50**

Mr. Hay writes from personal knowledge, as a long-time missionary of the Inland South America Missionary Union. He tells of the mental and spiritual needs of the eight millions of neglected Indians who live in all parts of South America, and of the gratifying results of missionary work that is being done among them, particularly by the Missionary Union.

*MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D.*

## Explorations at Sodom

Ancient Sodom in the Light of Modern Research. Illustrated, **$1.50**

"The author has become, through the years, one of our most famous archæologists. He has had opportunity to do considerable research work in the regions of the Dead Sea. His story, as contained in this volume, reads like a romance. A remarkable piece of work."—*Western Christian Advocate.*

*A. EUGENE BARTLETT*

## Out-of-the-Way Places in Europe

A New Idea Travel Guide-Book. Illustrated, **$1.50**

"This book is just what it claims to be. It is not the ordinary travel book, for it deals with places never seen by the ordinary traveler. Mr. Bartlett has gone to out-of-the-way places and his words make us wish that he had taken us with him."—*Watchman-Examiner.*

*ARCHIBALD RUTLEDGE*

## Life's Extras

Art Boards, 60c

A little book of illumination and inspiration for every one who believes in God or admires the works of nature. Mr. Rutledge, who has written many popular books on God's out-of-doors, here tells of "Life's Extras—one of those things which we do not have to have, but which we enjoy all the more for that very reason." A message to make one think and see—and be glad.

*THOMAS C. MUIR*

## Every Day---All the Way

Devotional Day-by-Day Book. $1.00

A welcome addition to the much used works of daily devotions, which are treasured in many homes next to the Bible itself. The author's treatment will be appreciated at once for its quiet charm and real helpfulness.

*RUTH E. ROBINSON (Editor)*

## A Girl of an Indian Garden

Letters of Flora Robinson Howells to her friends. Introduction by Bishop William F. McDowell and Clotilde L. McDowell. $1.00

A book for all young women eager to get the most out of life. The four chapters show how one may, by following such an example as was set by Flora Robinson, obtain personal power through discerning one's life vocation clearly, renewing one's strength daily, making the most of one's influence understandingly, and exalting one's faith in God and God's children at every opportunity. With questions at the end of each chapter.

*E. T. COLTON*

## Her Father's Tribute

A Memorial of Elizabeth Graham Colton. Introduction by John R. Mott. 75c

If only as an interpretation of the "Modern Girl" this small little sketch is greatly worth reading and remembering. But as Dr. Mott points out, it has a meaning for a multitude of persons young and old, "a beacon of spiritual light in a materialistic age." Mr. Colton, author of this tribute to his young daughter's life, is well known in Y. M. C. A. circles.

*D. E. LORENZ*

*Director of World Cruises*

## The Round-the-World Traveller
## The Mediterranean Traveller

New Pocket Edition. Revised to Date. Thin paper, cloth, round corners. Each, **$5.00**

New handy forms for the Lorenz travel-books, of which the Boston Transcript said: "Marvels of comprehensiveness and very conveniently arranged. Each properly illustrated, including maps, plans, pictures, etc.

## Hall Young of Alaska "The Mushing Parson"

The Autobiography of S. Hall Young, D.D. Second Edition. Illustrated, **$4.00**

*Dr. John A. Marquis says:* "While this book is a record of personal experiences, they are the experiences of a history-making epoch. The fifty years Hall Young spent in Alaska witnessed the transition of an aboriginal race from savagery to civilization, from primitive tribal confusion and anarchy to orderly government."

*ROGER W. BABSON*

## Instincts and Emotions

Second Edition. **$2.00**

*Roger W. Babson says:* "At the close of twenty-five years of statistical research I decided to take a month off to get the retrospect of what I had seen and learned—in fact the purchaser of this book may secure in one reading what I have spent years of time and millions of dollars to learn."

*FOR THE BUNYAN TERCENTENARY*

*ARTHUR PORTER, D.D.*

## The Inside of Bunyan's Dream

Illustrated, **$1.75**

*Dr. S. Parkes Cadman recommends it:* "Should mark the beginning of a new cult for Bunyan; for what he was, what he did, what he saw from the dungeon's darkness, and for what he anticipated of 'the powers of the world to come.'"

Date Due

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| [redacted] | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
|

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01012 8546